

136.7 R12r

Radke \$2.00

The relation of
parental authority
children's

136.7 R12r

Keep Your Card in This Pocket

Books will be issued only on presentation of proper library cards.

Unless labeled otherwise, books may be retained for two weeks. Borrowers finding books marked, defaced or mutilated are expected to report same at library desk; otherwise the last borrower will be held responsible for all imperfections discovered.

The card holder is responsible for all books drawn on this card.

Penalty for over-due books 2c a day plus cost of notices.

Lost cards and change of residence must be reported promptly.



Public Library
Kansas City, Mo.

Keep Your Card in This Pocket

BERKOWITZ ENVELOPE CO., K. C., MO.



0 0001 0267462 9

REC

DATE DUE

59 APR 4 '47	OC 23	
SOUTH END		
APR 9 '47		
95 APR 30 '47		
BLUE VALLEY		
3 MAY '47		
OCT 4 '47	Y 32	
NOV 30 '47		
JAN 29 '48	ab	
JUN 18 '48	84	
JUL 12 '48	AY	
MAY 1 '48	58	
JUL 24 '48		
JAN 20 1966		

THE RELATION OF PARENTAL AUTHORITY TO
CHILDREN'S BEHAVIOR AND ATTITUDES

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
THE INSTITUTE OF CHILD WELFARE
MONOGRAPH SERIES NO. XXII

The Relation of Parental Authority to Children's Behavior and Attitudes

BY

MARIAN J. RADKE

INSTRUCTOR, RESEARCH CENTER FOR GROUP DYNAMICS,
MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

1946

THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA PRESS

MINNEAPOLIS

Copyright 1946 by the
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

All rights reserved. No part of this book
may be reproduced in any form without
the written permission of the publisher.
Permission is hereby granted to reviewers
to quote brief passages in a review to be
printed in a magazine or newspaper.

PRINTED AT THE LUND PRESS, INC., MINNEAPOLIS



FOREWORD



In the past, the field of child behavior and family relations has been largely concerned with studies of the effects of specific factors upon the behavior of children. In recent years, with the improvement of research methods, the effects of contexts, backgrounds, and atmospheres in producing variations in behavior have come within the domain of science. Changes and improvements in the methods of studying personality have brought new understandings. Significant among the new methods used in the study of personality are the projective techniques, such as doll play and reactions to pictures of emotionally laden situations. In this monograph Dr. Radke explores the possibilities of some of these new techniques with young children and reports significant relations between the findings they produce and the behavior of children in school, the parents' conceptions of child training, the home atmospheres, and the experimental situations in which the child's compliance with authority was measured.

Dr. Radke finds marked differences between the child's concept of the parent and the parent's concept of himself as a guide for children. She compares the disciplinary program of the home in this generation with that of the previous generation, as reported by the parents, who felt that the present trend is toward less severe and less emotional discipline and toward greater respect for the child's personality. She classifies the homes in terms of the home atmosphere, using such categories as autocratic or democratic and freedom-giving or restrictive, and determines the relations of these atmospheres to measured aspects of the child's behavior. She finds relations between the home patterns and the child's behavior in school as shown by teachers' ratings and by the child's behavior in the experimental situations.

The results obtained in this study are not only of theoretical interest. The exploration of the various techniques used successfully in studies with older children and adults and their adaptation for use at earlier ages are also of substantial interest to those concerned with the methods of studying young children. Further, the relations found contribute directly to our knowledge of the child and the family and indicate the promise of the methods for adding to our

PARENTAL AUTHORITY AND CHILDREN'S BEHAVIOR

knowledge and understanding of children and for improving our everyday practices with children.

JOHN E. ANDERSON

Director, Institute of Child Welfare
University of Minnesota

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author is sincerely grateful to Dr. Florence Goodenough, who gave valuable assistance in planning this research; to Dr. John E. Anderson, who made available the facilities of the Institute of Child Welfare and gave helpful guidance in the preparation of the monograph; to the preschool children and their parents who served as subjects; to the preschool teachers who contributed data on the children; and to Miss Jean Sutherland and Mr. Lakin Phillips, who gave effective assistance in recording and rating the data and in preparing the manuscript.

M. J. R.

CONTENTS

I. THE PROBLEM	1
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE ON PARENT-CHILD RELATIONSHIPS	3
Clinical Literature—Semi-Experimental and Experimental Literature—Summary of Literature on Parent-Child Relationships	
III. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE ON PROJECTIVE TECHNIQUES	14
Clinical Literature—Semi-Experimental and Experimental Literature	
IV. DESIGN OF THE EXPERIMENT	24
The Problem—The Subjects—The Procedure—Preview of Analysis	
V. ANALYSIS OF PARENTS' QUESTIONNAIRE-INTERVIEW DATA	35
Parents' Reports on the Discipline and Authority Relations of Their Own Childhood—Parents' Reports on Discipline and Authority Areas in the Home	
VI. ANALYSIS OF THE CHILDREN'S INTERVIEW DATA	52
Children's Standards of "Good" and "Bad" Behavior—Children's Perceptions of Home Authority and Discipline Relations—Summary	
VII. RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN HOME ATMOSPHERE AND CHILD BEHAVIOR	73
Home Atmosphere and Child Behavior Ratings in Preschool—Home Atmospheres and Experimental Situations of Compliance—Differences in Parent-Child Relations Related to Sex Differences—Summary	
VIII. ANALYSIS OF PROJECTIVE PICTURE DATA	88
Scoring of Picture Responses—Reliability of the Picture Data—Validity of the Picture Data—Relations between	

viii PARENTAL AUTHORITY AND CHILDREN'S BEHAVIOR

Picture Scores and Other Data on the Home Atmosphere
—Relations between Picture Scores and Child Behavior—
Evaluation of Projective Picture Technique

IX. ANALYSIS OF DOLL PLAY DATA.....	94
Scoring and Reliability of Doll Play Responses—Relations between Doll Play Data and Other Data on the Child— Summary and Evaluation of Doll Play Data	
X. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION	101
Summary of Findings—Comparison of Findings with Pre- vious Reports in the Literature—Contributions of This Research—Problems for Further Research	
XI. APPLICATIONS AND THEORETICAL IMPLICA- TIONS	106
APPENDIX I. PARENTS' INVENTORY	109
APPENDIX II. ORAL QUESTIONNAIRE GIVEN TO CHILD	113
APPENDIX III. TEACHERS' RATING SCALE.....	115
APPENDIX IV. EXCERPTS FROM DOLL PLAY RECORDS	117
BIBLIOGRAPHY	118
INDEX	121

LIST OF TABLES

1. Comparison of Parents' and Grandparents' Disciplinary Standards and Practices Based on Matched Questionnaire Items	39
2. Parents' Evaluations of Discipline in the Grandparent Gen- eration	42
3. Comparison of Parents' and Child's Perceptions of Home Relations	45

LIST OF TABLES

ix

4. Comparison of Mothers' and Fathers' Disciplinary Standards and Practices on the Basis of Answers to Identical Questionnaire Items	46
5. Children's Standards of Good Behavior.....	54
6. Children's Standards of Bad Behavior.....	54
7. Children's Reported Feelings as a Result of Parental Punishments	57
8. Children's Reasons for Obedience to Parents.....	58
9. Percentage of Children Reporting Fear of Parents.....	59
10. Children's Reports of Their Parents' Affections.....	63
11. Children's Reports of Fun with Their Parents.....	63
12. Forms of Parental Punishment Recommended by Children.	65
13. Percentage of Children Using Various Methods of Controlling Parents	66
14. Types of Parental Behavior Disliked by Children.....	67
15. Children's Perceptions of the Kind of Change in Their Behavior Desired by the Parent.....	67
16. Children's Descriptions of Mothers and Fathers.....	69
17. Teachers' Ratings of Preschool Behavior on the Basis of Home Atmosphere Variables	74
18. Reliability of Picture Scores.....	89
19. Relations between Picture Scores and Ratings of Child Behavior	92
20. Consistency between Doll Play Behavior in Interview I and Interview II	95
21. Comparison of Children's Descriptions of Mothers and Fathers from Interviews and from Projective Play Data....	98
22. Average Scores on Home Atmosphere Variables of Children Showing Divergent Intrafamily Relations in Doll Play Themes	98

LIST OF FIGURES

1. Examples of Materials Used in the Picture Series.....	30
2. Comparison of Discipline in Parent and Grandparent Generations	38
3. Kinds of Punishment Reported by Parents.....	50
4. Children's Descriptions of Mothers and Fathers.....	70
5. Mothers' and Fathers' Preferences in Children's Behavior...	84
6. Parents' Preferences in Boys' and Girls' Behavior.....	84
7. Mothers' and Fathers' Preferences in Boys' and Girls' Behavior	85
8. Portrayals of Mothers and Fathers in Doll Play.....	99

I. THE PROBLEM

"Why does the individual behave in this way?" is a persistent, complex, and largely unanswered question in psychology. A great number of psychological problems resolve into this fundamental question. It is this question which the clinician asks concerning the "problem child," the psychiatrist concerning the "psychopathic personality," the social worker concerning the delinquent, the parent concerning his child.

It is of utmost importance to society to understand the development of attitudes and behavior and to understand how they can be modified. Much progress has been made in psychology toward answering these questions, but most of the work lies ahead. Explanations of behavior are no longer sought in terms of single variables; the interdependence of many coexisting factors is taken into account. Also, the necessity of studying the psychologically real conditions for the persons involved is recognized. The reality of the social space in which the individual lives and the importance of the subjective or personal meaning of the situation in determining the individual's behavior have been stressed, especially in the research stimulated by Lewin (1939, 1944).

The effects on behavior of experimentally created social atmospheres have been demonstrated by Lewin, Lippitt, and White (1939). Such experimentally created atmospheres over a short period of time produced marked differences in the behavior of the children experiencing them. Generalizing from these results, it seems likely that various psychological atmospheres operating over long periods are of significance in determining differences in behavior and attitudes. Variations of atmospheres within the home environment appear, therefore, as important factors to consider in understanding children's behavior.

In this research one major variable of the child's home environment, the area of parental authority and discipline, and the correlates of this variable in the child's attitudes and social behavior have been investigated. The demands and satisfactions of his home situation have been studied in relation to the child's behavior and personality characteristics.

Authority and discipline relations constitute a major aspect of the individual's life both in the areas of personal living and in

larger social contexts. Authority and discipline do not represent only unpleasant areas of the young child's life, for on many occasions the child depends on the adult's authority; he seeks not only freedom but control from the adult. This positive aspect of discipline has received little attention in the literature. The concept of authority and discipline relations underlying this research includes both the positive and negative aspects: the traditional elements of punishment, obedience, and restrictions as well as the guidance and motivational techniques employed by the adult to influence the behavior of the child.

For a thorough analysis of variations in this area of parent-child relationships, several dimensions of authority and discipline should be considered (Anderson, 1944): Variations exist in the *philosophy* of discipline (usually un verbalized) to which the parent adheres. There are also variations in the *pervasiveness* of parental discipline. For some children adult authority and discipline permeate every area of the home life, so that there are few or no islands of freedom from adult control. In other homes the child is allowed self-direction in some areas but is closely supervised in others. These areas may be made relatively distinct and separate from one another by some parents; by others they may be left unclearly separated and unstable. Parental discipline and authority vary in the *consistency* with which they are exercised. The circumstances and areas of behavior eliciting parental authority and discipline are, in some families, highly predictable. In others they are more closely related to parental whim and circumstance than to the child's needs. There is also the variable of *method* of discipline, and closely related to method is the *effectiveness* with which it is applied.

Secondary to the main problem of this research is a problem of methodology: to investigate the value of "projective" techniques for obtaining from young children data on home discipline and authority relations.

Before describing the procedure of the present study, the relevant literature in the fields of parent-child relationships and of projective techniques will be reviewed and evaluated.

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE ON PARENT-CHILD RELATIONSHIPS

The literature on parent-child relationships is too extensive to be surveyed adequately in a brief review. This review is confined, therefore, to the most relevant studies dealing with psychological atmospheres of the home and their behavioral concomitants in the young child. Much of the literature on parent-child relationships is nonexperimental in nature. Although it does not possess the precision and accuracy desired for diagnosis, therapy, and prediction, it is suggestive of trends in the relationships between the home environment and the behavior of the child.

Nonexperimental reports are unanimous in the opinion that the influence of the home is exceedingly great in the life of the child, because of the primacy, pervasiveness, and long duration of its contacts with him. Teagarden (1940, page 229) goes so far as to say that "there is accumulating evidence that all manner of behavior deviations can be and often are accounted for by the subtleties of home relationships."

Faegre and Anderson (1940, pages 280-81) express a similar faith in the amount of influence the home brings to bear upon the child:

Granting the extent to which the responsibility for some types of training has been shifted to the schools, the home still offers the earliest, and in many respects the most thorough, education which a child receives. . . . We have seen that the personality of the child is emerging among all the influences of the early environment and is being shaped by them, and that the family represents the world of the child in which, long before he reaches school age, he has been meeting situations and developing ways of reacting to them. Because he is more frequently and more profoundly moved or stimulated by persons than by the inanimate part of his environment, the home, with its close association with a number of personalities, becomes the field in which the child tests out and comes to appreciate the value of certain types of behavior.

Probably the hypothesis that Champney (1941a) has expressed puts the problem in its proper perspective. He states that a given parent acts toward a given child in certain ways which tend to be consistent from situation to situation and which

tend to differentiate this parent from other parents. These consistently repeated situations are learning situations for the child, in which he builds up social habit systems that in time constitute his personality.

According to Murphy, Murphy, and Newcomb (1937, pages 208-9), the child's "self" is the outcome of his experiences in the home. Learning by the child from his parents comes about not so much "by being taught, but by being exposed." What the parent is, is far more important as an influence upon his child than the specific techniques he employs. These authors state, too, that very early the role of the child in the group reflects the needs, frustrations, satisfactions, and anxieties in his home situation.

The psychoanalysts have always been insistent about attributing personality characteristics of the individual to the effects of his early experiences. The child's relation to his parents has been elaborately theorized by them.

For more precise evaluations of the nature of home influences, one must turn to data from clinical and experimental investigations.

CLINICAL LITERATURE

No aspect of parental behavior has received more attention from clinicians than the rejection-overprotection variable. The criteria for determining the presence of these conditions in the home vary with the investigator. Sometimes it is determined by the case worker's judgment, sometimes by the mother's statement, and sometimes by the presence or absence of a number of predetermined indicators of rejection or overprotection.

Newell reports several studies of maternal rejection (1934, 1936). His results are based on analyses of clinical case histories and psychiatric examinations. Using neglect, cruelty, a guilt reaction of overprotection, and inconsistent discipline as criteria of maternal rejection, he found feelings of insecurity and extreme sensitivity to attention characteristic of rejected children.

In a second study he compared rejected children with a control group of accepted children, using as his criteria of rejection the mother's statement of it and her hostile behavior toward the child. In comparison with the control group, the rejected children received less consistent handling by their parents and showed less stable and more aggressive behavior. Newell concludes that

where parental treatment is hostile, boys show aggressive behavior; where treatment is protective, boys show submissive behavior. Girls show mixed behavior where parental treatment is hostile, and submissive behavior where the father is protective or ambivalent. This is undoubtedly an oversimplification of the relationships.

From case study analyses of 25 5- and 6-year-old children, Zimmerman (1931) reports a tendency for aggressive children to have overprotecting or rejecting mothers, and for timid children to have oversolicitous or overanxious mothers.

Witmer (1933) classified parental behavior in 76 cases which had been closed as successfully adjusted and in 64 cases which had been closed as unimproved. Where there were evidences in the case records of overt maternal rejection of the child or of extreme ambivalence, successful adjustment of the child's difficulties was shown in 4 cases, and in 34 cases no improvement was noted. Where the mother was overprotective and the father played a weak role, failure in adjustment was usual. Where the mother overprotected the child and the father rejected the child, successful adjustment was more likely. Most of the successful cases were in families in which parents were kind and affectionate, in which they criticized the child's behavior but did not dislike the child.

Relying upon case reports collected by former students of his, Symonds (1939) compared 31 pairs of accepted and rejected children. The pairs were matched in sex, age, grade, social background, and level of intelligence. Measuring instruments consisted of check lists of items concerning the child's behavior, parental harmony, and factors in the parents' childhood. Chi-square differences were computed. The accepted children showed significantly more socially acceptable behavior than the rejected children. Also, accepted children faced the future more confidently, were less confused and discouraged, and had fewer feelings of insecurity than rejected children.

Hattwick and Stowell (1936) related the rejection-overprotection variable to the child's adjustments in the elementary school. Working with cumulative records prepared by successive classroom teachers at the end of each year, the authors report a predominance of poor work habits in children from homes characterized by "babying" or pressure. More than three fourths of the children from well-adjusted homes showed good

work habits. The same trends appeared when the teachers' descriptions of the children's good and poor social adjustments were related to the home situation.

The effects of dominating and submissive parents upon child behavior are pointed out by Symonds (1939). Twenty-eight pairs of children were studied, one of each pair coming from a home of dominating parents, the other from a home of submissive parents. The average age of the children was 12 years. Children of the dominating parents were described as polite, honest, dependable, submissive, humble, shy, and self-conscious. Children of the submissive parents were described as aggressive, disobedient, careless, independent, self-confident, overconfident, rebellious, forward, and free in making friends outside the family.

In each of the investigations of parent-child relationships reviewed thus far, the authors have begun with the classification of parental attitudes and have sought correlates of these attitudes in the child's behavior. An alternative approach is to begin with children of contrasting clinical groups and to compare them with respect to predominant parental features. The following studies have used this approach.

Knight (1933), comparing clinical data on aggressive and submissive children, describes homes of submissive children as essentially harmonious and homes of aggressive children as inharmonious. Maternal attitudes tended to be overprotective for the submissive children and rejective for the aggressive children.

Case reports on neurotic children studied by Karlin (1930) showed a predominance of marital discord, parental neuroticism, faulty discipline, and unwholesome parent-child relationships.

The homes of children who manifest sibling jealousy have been compared with those of children who do not by Foster (1927), Sewall (1930), and Ross (1931). Case histories disclose a greater frequency in the homes of jealous children of such factors as oversolicitousness, neglect, inconsistent discipline, limited play and social opportunities for the child, undue attachment to one parent, and parental maladjustment.

Comparisons of the homes of delinquent and nondelinquent children yield similar results (Berkman, 1932; Yeranian, 1932; Gosset, 1932; Healy, 1915; Burt, 1929).

Obvious deficiencies in these clinical reports—loose definitions of home and personality variables, reliance upon case histories,

overemphasis upon deviate children, absence of control groups with which to compare clinical groups, lack of data on the positive effects of the home, frequent assumptions of direct causal relationships, and lack of experimental controls in procedure and analysis of data—limit the conclusions that can be drawn from them. The reports that follow in general represent an improvement in method over the clinical studies.

SEMI-EXPERIMENTAL AND EXPERIMENTAL LITERATURE

An interest in the origin of personality differences among preschool children has led a number of experimenters to study the relations between various kinds of home environment and preschool behavior. In one such study, reported by Hattwick (1936), ratings of preschool behavior and home variables of 335 children were obtained. Preschool behavior included such variables as nervous habits, jealousy, crying easily, and refusal to comply. Home factors included overattentiveness, negligence, calm or tense atmosphere, sharing of responsibilities, and so on. Tetrachoric correlations showed relationships between overattentiveness in the home and infantile, withdrawing behavior and asking of unnecessary help in school; between inadequate attention in the home and aggressive, attention-seeking behavior in school; between calm and happy home life and cooperative behavior and good emotional adjustment at school; between responsibilities in the home and self-reliance in school; between "babying" or "pushing" in the home and social difficulties in school.

A similar investigation was carried out by Baruch (1937) with 33 preschool children. Observations and ratings of the children and parents revealed significant relationships between parental and child adjustments.

Observations on 22 kindergarten children and interviews with their parents were secured by Gottemoller (1939), and variables were compared. Five out of six unwelcome children were rated as shy, withdrawn, stubborn, and maladjusted in school. Most children who had received no sex instruction were maladjusted in kindergarten. Specific aspects of discipline methods showed slight relation to children's behavior ratings, but ratings of parents' attitudes toward child-rearing methods were highly correlated with child adjustment.

Ayer and Bernreuter (1937) compared personality ratings of

40 nursery school children with the parents' statements concerning discipline in the home. Biserial correlations were obtained between the frequency of each type of punishment and the personality ratings. Frequent use of physical punishment was negatively related to dependence upon adult affection and attention ($-.20$) and tendency to face reality ($-.35$). Allowing the child to profit from the natural results of his acts was positively related to attractiveness of personality ($+.33$), tendency to face reality ($+.33$), and independence of adult affection and attention ($+.37$). Giving the child rewards was positively correlated with ratings of sociability with other children ($+.30$). Parental techniques of worrying the child were negatively related to attractiveness of personality ($-.21$), tendency to face reality ($-.30$), and dependence upon adult affection and attention ($-.44$). Doing the first thing that pops into a parent's head is negatively correlated with dependence upon adult affection and attention ($-.40$), tendency to face reality ($-.52$), and attractiveness of personality ($-.54$).

Grant (Updegraff, 1939) correlated the ratings on 33 nursery school children with parental behavior variables. Correlated with parental overprotection were withdrawing and submissive behavior; with parental rejection, ascendant and sadistic behavior; with extreme overprotection or rejection, nervous habits and feelings of insecurity; with a "logical-scientific" parental approach, self-reliant and responsible behavior; with a calm and happy home, cooperativeness and feelings of security.

Adult authority and the preschool child's responses to it were studied by Meyers (1944) in a series of experimental play settings, in which the child was given pairs of commands by two adults. The commands were of four types: agreeing-positive, disagreeing-positive, agreeing-negative, and disagreeing-negative. Running accounts were kept of the behavior shown under these command conditions. Maturity level of behavior was significantly lower after disagreeing-positive, agreeing-negative, and disagreeing-negative commands than before commands. There was no drop in maturity level of behavior after agreeing-positive commands. After agreeing-negative and disagreeing-negative commands, children showed more stiff, inhibited behavior than before commands. Commands giving opposing directions to the child and negative-agreeing commands resulted in decreases in constructive activity. Nervous manifestations

increased after agreeing-negative and disagreeing-negative commands. Differences in amount of compliance in the four types of command situations were slight, except for the disagreeing-positive commands, which resulted in frequent noncompliance. When children's compliance was related to the teacher's ratings of the parents, parents of noncompliant children were rated higher on rejection and submission than were other parents.

In an interesting series of investigations with 8- to 16-year-old children, Meltzer (1935) employed a free associational technique to learn something of the child's attitudes toward his parents. The free associations about each parent were classified according to the child's feeling toward the parent and according to the role of the parent in the eyes of the child. About half the responses described parents as persons who do things for or with the child. These responses were more frequent for fathers than for mothers. Mothers were more often the persons for whom responses of love and loyalty were given. In most of the classifications the reactions toward mothers and fathers did not differ materially. Age and sex differences were not analyzed, and no attempt was made to relate the responses to the child's behavior or to his home situation.

Using an interview technique, Meltzer (1941) studied the parental preference patterns of 150 children from the fifth to the eighth grade. According to his results mothers were preferred more frequently than fathers; mothers were preferred more frequently by boys than girls; and fathers were preferred more frequently by girls than boys. Where emotional attachments to parents deviated from the desirable, there was a tendency toward overdependence in the girls and toward insecurity and rejection in the boys. The greater number of insecurity reactions by girls were given toward the father; the greater number by boys were given toward the mother. Both boys and girls showed more overdependence toward the mother and more rejection toward the father. Meltzer is of the opinion that the division of labor between parents in the present economic system is responsible for the differences in parental preferences between boys and girls.

Simpson's study (1935) supports the finding of a general preference for mothers in both boys and girls. The preference for the father decreases as the child grows older. Such factors as showing affection toward the child, taking care of his physical

wants, punishing him least, and playing with him appear to be influential in determining preference.

Duvall (1937) measured the social distance between child and parents by asking questions such as these: "In the past year, how many times have you discussed something that was worrying you with your mother? With your father? How many times have you asked advice from your mother? From your father? How many times have you quarreled with your mother? With your father?" He concluded that among children 12 to 17 years old the younger ones showed greater nearness to their parents; that at each age children were closer to the mother; that as age increased, the distance between father and child increased. Boys reported discipline "too strict" more frequently than girls. Fathers were more often considered "too easy" than were mothers.

An extensive series of studies of family attitudes was carried out by Stott (1940a, 1940b) on more than a thousand adolescents and their parents in rural areas, small towns, and cities of the Middle West. Questionnaires and personality tests were used. About a third of the adolescents reported items they disliked in their parents' behavior—items that were related, for the most part, to matters of discipline and control, temperamental traits, personal habits, beliefs of the parents, and emotional adjustments. The rural children were somewhat more ready to accept parental authority and control than were either the small-town or the city groups.

Stott (1939) stresses, and rightly so, that we cannot hope to understand the relation of family factors to the child's development until we have determined the fundamental patternings in family life. Single, isolated items will do little to further our understanding of dynamic relationships. He stresses (1941) also that the home situation has personal significance for the individual child and that special attention, therefore, must be given to the unique role of each child in each family. Parents treat children within the same family quite differently, and often the same parental treatment may have very different meanings for different children. It is this latter fact that makes it impossible to set up hard and fast standards of child-rearing methods without regard for the individual personality differences in parents and children.

Studying home environment and adjustment of high school

pupils, Myers (1935) found good adjustment correlated with severe discipline by the father, absence of parental nagging, treating the child like an adult, considering the child's point of view, and rewarding the child's good behavior. Unrelated to adjustment were use of physical punishment when children were young, withdrawal of privilege, lecturing or moralizing, and interference of one parent with the discipline given by the other parent. Correlated with poor adjustment were the giving of entire discipline responsibility to one parent, continuance of physical punishment at high school age, failure to carry out threatened punishments, moderate discipline by the father, and the parent's mood determining the kind of punishment. Strict and lax discipline appear with equal frequency in the records of well and poorly adjusted children. There were significant differences between well and poorly adjusted students on the items concerning parental compatibility.

Anderson (1940), studying junior high school students, found a tendency for children who described their parents as critical, nagging, severe in punishment, or overstrict or extremely lenient in supervision to be rated by their classmates as aggressive, rebellious, and "show-off." Parents relatively high in affection and relatively low in dominance toward their children tended to have cooperative, stable, cheerful, obedient children. Parents relatively low in affection and relatively high in dominance tended to have uncooperative, quarrelsome, disobedient, bold, tense, disinterested children. There were no marked sex differences in the patterns of parent-child relationships and few reliable differences in the degree of influence of mothers and fathers on children's behavior.

SUMMARY OF LITERATURE ON PARENT-CHILD RELATIONSHIPS

Relationships between the home and child behavior, as reported in the literature, are summarized below:

<i>Type of Home</i>	<i>Type of Child Behavior Associated with It</i>	<i>Investigator</i>
Rejective	Submissive	Newell (1936)
	Aggressive	Grant (1939), Newell (1936), Zimmerman (1931)
	Adjustment difficulties	Witmer (1933)
	Feelings of insecurity	Grant (1939), Newell (1934)
	Sadistic	Grant (1939)
	Nervous	Grant (1939)
	Shy, stubborn	Gottmoller (1939)
	Noncompliant	Meyers (1944)

<i>Type of Home</i>	<i>Type of Child Behavior Associated with It</i>	<i>Investigator</i>
Overprotective, "baby-ing"	Infantile and withdrawing Submissive Feelings of insecurity Aggressive Jealous Difficult adjustment Nervous	Grant (1939), Hattwick (1936), Zimmerman (1931) Newell (1936), Grant (1939) Grant (1939) Zimmerman (1931) Sewall (1930) Hattwick and Stowell (1936), Witmer (1933) Grant (1939)
Dominating parent	Dependable, shy, submissive, polite, self-conscious Uncooperative, tense, bold, quarrelsome, disinterested	Symonds (1939) Anderson (1940)
Submissive parent	Aggressive, careless, disobedient, independent, self-confident, forward in making friends Noncompliant	Symonds (1939) Meyers (1944)
Inharmonious	Aggressive Neurotic Jealous Delinquent Uncooperative	Knight (1933), Hattwick (1936) Karlin (1930) Foster (1927), Sewall (1930) Yeranian (1932), Gosset (1932), Burt (1929) Hattwick (1936)
Defective discipline	Poor adjustment Aggressive, rebellious Jealous Delinquent Neurotic	Myers (1935), Ayer and Bernreuter (1937) Anderson (1940) Sewall (1930) Burt (1929) Karlin (1930)
Harmonious, well-adjusted	Submissive Good adjustment	Knight (1933) Hattwick and Stowell (1936)
Calm, happy, compatible	Cooperative Superior adjustment Independent	Hattwick (1936), Anderson (1940), Grant (1939) Stott (1940) Stott (1939)
Child accepted	Socially acceptable Faces future confidently	Symonds (1939) Symonds (1939)
Parents play with child	Security feelings Self-reliant	Hattwick (1936) Hattwick (1936)
Logical, scientific approach	Self-reliant Cooperative Responsible	Grant (1939) Grant (1939) Grant (1939)
Consistent, strict discipline	Good adjustment	Myers (1935)
Giving child responsibilities	Good adjustment Self-reliant Security feelings	Myers (1935) Hattwick (1936) Hattwick (1936)

The literature on parent-child relationships leaves no room to doubt that some variations of personality are related to variations within the home. The nature of these interactions, however, has not emerged with any degree of clarity. There is no easy short cut to unraveling their complexity except through renewed and revised research attempts. Part of the difficulty that studies in this area have encountered is due to the fact that the investigators have been content with unanalyzed, generalized, stereotyped descriptions of the home. The result is a seemingly hopeless confusion of generalizations in the reported findings. This is seen clearly in the summary. Understanding can be attained only as the home is perceived and studied in terms of the areas of stimulation, of freedom and restraint, of security and insecurity, of tension and satisfaction which it offers the individual child.

The present study attempts to define in a more exact manner certain variables related to the home and to the child, and to seek out positive as well as negative influences of the home in a nonproblem-child population.

III. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE ON PROJECTIVE TECHNIQUES

A brief survey of the status of projective techniques in the study of child personality is appropriate since projective methods constitute a part of the experimental design of this research.

Fully aware of the limitations of existing methods of studying personality, clinicians and experimentalists have sought methods by which the motivating factors underlying behavior, the subtleties and covert aspects of personality organization, may be made more accessible to investigation. Projective techniques appeared promising as a means of improving diagnosis and prediction.

Projective techniques cannot be regarded as new in psychology, although the flare of interest in them in the present century would make them appear so. The concepts underlying them are old. In one form or another they have appeared again and again in the history of psychology, never establishing for themselves a firm or entirely respected position in science. The concept of projection as it is used in projective techniques is a process in which the individual identifies himself with some aspect of the world outside himself and puts there what is in or of himself. Certain properties of the individual are believed to be reflected in his behavior toward the outside world.

In projective procedures the subject is placed in a stimulus field in which he is encouraged to react freely. The field is usually one that allows the subject to bring into play his fantasies and behavioral tendencies in a relatively undirected manipulation of the stimulus materials. In interpreting the situation, he is believed to reveal much of himself—his private world, his inhibited or unconscious tendencies, his attitudes, his needs. To elicit significant and idiosyncratic responses, the individual is presented with a relatively unstructured situation that will allow and foster individual reaction. Whether projection so described actually exists remains to be proved. The subject's manipulation of the stimulus field may not be construed, willy-nilly, to represent projection.

Projective techniques include a wide variety of procedures differing (1) in the degree of structuring or plasticity in the

stimulus situation, (2) in the materials used, (3) in the kind of responses elicited, and (4) in the purpose or area of personality toward which they are directed.

(1) The degree of structuring of a stimulus situation refers to the adaptability of the stimulus materials to individual uses, meanings, and organization. The unstructured situation is relatively free of definite, limiting meanings or uses and does not suggest specific functions to the subject. Examples are situations in which the subject is given dramatic materials (mud, clay, finger paints, and the like) and is allowed to create and interpret as he wishes. Semistructured situations are illustrated by unfinished stories which the subject is asked to complete or by cloud pictures or inkblots which he is asked to interpret. The most highly structured projective techniques usually involve a kind of multiple choice procedure—such as a choice of story completions or a choice of pictures—in which the subject is required to project his personality on one or another of the response patterns forced by the stimulus situations.

Horowitz and Murphy (1938) emphasize the advantages of the extremely unstructured materials because of their capacity to draw a wide range of spontaneous responses from the subject. The freedom of expression they allow readily exposes the subject's feelings, anxieties, attitudes, and needs. A disadvantage of the unstructured methods is that unless the subject's field of response is somehow narrowed, he is unlikely to express the particular aspect of personality in which the experimenter is interested. With greater freedom of response there are corresponding difficulties in applying experimental controls and objective interpretations. The structured and semistructured methods, however, control and restrict the data to a particular personality area, and, though they still allow the subject to project his own personality upon the material, the data are more amenable to precise and objective analysis. When structured and unstructured projective techniques are used in combination on the same problem and with the same subjects, the limitations of one are offset to some degree by the other.

(2) Projective techniques vary not only in degree of structuring but also in the materials and stimuli employed. Doll and toy play, pictorial presentations and interpretations, dramatic presentations and interpretations, word associations, interpretations of music, odors, expressive movements, inkblot inter-

pretations (Rorschach investigations are not included in this review), and plastic materials are among the variety of stimulus materials. Many variations of procedures and stimuli are possible within each of these categories.

(3) The responses obtained from projective techniques may be attitudes, feelings and emotions, interpretations, creations, and verbal or motor activity. One classification of projective procedures (Frank, 1939) has been attempted on the basis of the kind of responses elicited.

(4) Projective techniques vary considerably in purpose. Their earliest, and still most frequent, applications are as clinical techniques of catharsis or therapy. More recently attempts have been made by experimentalists to apply scientific controls so as to permit their use as valid scientific instruments.

Like any other innovation in psychological method that has descended upon American psychology, projective techniques have been hailed and condemned with equal vigor. They have furnished good bait for those who want to find an easy solution to the intricacies of personality measurement. To the investigator who appraises them more objectively it is at once apparent that there is as yet inadequate basis for wholehearted scientific acceptance or rejection.

The case which has been built up *against* projective techniques as they are now employed is (1) that the validity of their basic assumption has not been adequately established; (2) that the degree of self-consistency in projective products is undetermined; (3) that the form of the results makes comparable treatment of data from groups of subjects extremely difficult; (4) that objective scoring and analysis of the results have not been used; and (5) that no check is put on the investigator's own imaginings and theoretical biases in the interpretation of the data.

In the face of these criticisms the case *for* the projective method may be summed up as follows: Everyone will admit the frequency of individual "distortions" of objective stimuli. These distortions or individual interpretations, somehow derived from and dependent upon the experiences, values, and motivational matrix of the individual, if fully understood would go far in unraveling present unknowns of personality structuring and functioning. The projective method is one means of exposing the world of the individual as he sees it and reacts to it.

A timely evaluation of projective techniques comes from MacFarlane (1942). The problem which is most seriously in need of clarification is that concerned with research validation. Two types of investigation are suggested by MacFarlane: a comparison of projective protocols of contrasting groups and a search for clinical correlates of similar and contrasting protocols.

The most suitable method of establishing the validity of projective techniques is debatable. Methods of temporal or longitudinal validation, measurement of the congruity among data obtained through collateral experimental approaches, and study of the predictive accuracy of the projective results are possible solutions. Frank (1939) takes the position that the use of statistical methods of validation is unnecessary and that these methods themselves are not above criticism. He advocates instead the use of methods of temporal validation and of congruity of data obtained by different procedures from the same subjects. MacFarlane's discussion may be cited as a reply to Frank's position: If one relies upon long-time consistency among the individual's projective products and life history data, the congruities may be only an "artifact of the stability of the concepts" rather than a true congruency of the data. With the aid of conceptual tools, materials which on the surface appear incongruent may be validly subsumed under one concept. The danger is present, however, of producing a nonvalid congruence by forcing all material into a few categories. Furthermore, in the use of longitudinal validation, inconsistencies over a period of time need not disprove the validity of the products but may reflect true changes in the personality organization.

A review and evaluation of the work that has been done with the projective method will serve as a starting point for further research. The picture presented in the literature is unclear and confused. The confusion stems from the heterogeneous backgrounds of persons employing the projective method and from the variety of purposes it is to fulfill. The following review is concerned with work with children, except where a study of adult subjects has special bearing on problems related to child study.

CLINICAL LITERATURE

The clinical reports may be examined as to the concepts they involve, the kind of population with which they deal, and the methods of interpretation or validation they employ.

The psychoanalytic work with children fostered by Melanie Klein (1932) and Anna Freud (1928) has made use of projective procedures. In Anna Freud's work, fantasies, drawings, and play techniques have a part. Play techniques are not considered as useful as free association and fantasies, because, although play supplies the therapist with observational data about the child's reactions and impulses, not everything in the play is significant or symbolic. Therefore in Anna Freud's work it is given little interpretation and has only an incidental role in her treatment of the child.

Melanie Klein attaches greater significance to the play sessions. She gives the child toys and allows him to do as he likes. Although she believes that the play is symbolic and interprets it, she stresses the necessity of making the interpretation in the light of the child's total personality and not on the basis of isolated symbols which appear in the play.

The free play method is reported by Gitelson (1938a, 1938b), Tallman and Goldensohn (1941), Weiss-Frankel (1941), and Watson (1940). These clinicians allow the child to develop the situation as he sees fit, and they themselves play a nonaggressive role through most of the sessions. The clinician is not merely a sympathetic, tolerant onlooker, however; he must be able to apprehend the child's tensions and anxieties and to deal with them appropriately.

Play techniques in which the clinician exercises some control are used by Solomon (1938), Levy (1933, 1937, 1939), and Conn (1939). Levy (1939) has developed a play technique which he describes as "release therapy." The children are allowed to "play out" their tensions, rivalries, and difficulties.

Solomon's method requires active participation of the therapist. He creates with dolls special play situations representing the life experiences of the patient. The child's play is confined to the situations created for him by the therapist, who by means of "therapeutic suggestions . . . directs the future thinking of the child." The value of his procedure lies, he believes, in the child's release of hostility toward parents and siblings and in the free expression of fantasies.

Conn (1939) also has planned play situations which are repeated at each session with the child. Within the planned situation the child is allowed to play freely. The procedure is so arranged that the child speaks for the doll. The interviewer asks

questions pertinent to the particular problem, but always with reference to the doll. For example, to a boy brought to the clinic for car sickness, the interviewer asked such questions as: "This boy is riding on the streetcar. How does he feel? What does he think? What else?"

Other descriptions of the clinical use of projective play techniques are found in reports by Fries (1937), Holmer (1937), Taft (1933), Bender and Woltmann (1936, 1937), Erickson (1940), Lowenfeld (1938), Katz (1942), Rogers (1939), and others.

Many biases can be noted in the clinical reports. The population with which all have been concerned is a problem-child population. This selective factor should suggest caution in the interpretation of results. Almost nonexistent in these reports is an effort to establish the validity of the interpretations placed upon the play results.

SEMI-EXPERIMENTAL AND EXPERIMENTAL LITERATURE

A systematic and comprehensive investigation of personality by means of projective techniques has been carried on under the direction of H. A. Murray (1938). By combining clinical and experimental procedures and developing a theoretical structure in which to fit the data, he has made a significant contribution to this method. One need not accept Murray's systematic scheme. It is as yet unproved, but it has advantages over many other reports in that it orders the data obtained by projective techniques into quantitatively defined terms and makes possible the setting up of hypotheses that can be tested in terms of the scheme.

Murray's investigations have had an influence upon other studies of the projective method. The Murray Thematic Apperception Test especially has received much attention in studies of children and adults, in both its original and its modified forms (Balken and Vander Veer, 1940; Amen, 1941).

In interviews with 40 unselected, delinquent boys, ages 10 to 12 years, Schwartz (1932) presented a series of "social-situation" pictures: a boy fishing, a man making a boy steal from a peddler, a boy leaving his house crying while the mother sits on the porch with her arms around the sister, and so forth. The child was asked to describe what he saw and to tell the meaning of each picture. Responses were classified as *usual* and *unusual or unique*.

The approach is an interesting one, which would lend itself easily to more careful analysis. Responses of delinquent and nondelinquent groups could be compared. Such analyses would answer questions as to the diagnostic accuracy of pictorial techniques for this kind of subject.

Horowitz and Murphy (1938) suggest the possible value of exploring children's ideas about themselves by the use of paired pictures, chosen to tap the child's conception of himself. They suggest the establishment of norms of what young children know about themselves. By this method, too, they propose picking out the deviant subjects. In this way the child who is somehow "different" could be studied intensively, and perhaps cues could be obtained for a better understanding of such children.

Of all the varieties of projective techniques the one most commonly used with children is the play technique. As a purely clinical method its use has already been discussed. Experimental controls have been applied in a number of investigations. In a study by Despert (1940) preschool children were allowed free play with dolls and drawing materials. Doll material consisted of four dolls—father, mother, baby, and either a boy or a girl doll—all dressed in night clothes, and three partition rooms with double bed, single bed, and crib. Play sessions lasted 10 to 62 minutes. The experimenter played a passive role. The room was equipped with a one-way vision screen and a dictaphone. Verbal, motor, and affective responses were recorded. Additional data were obtained through developmental histories of the children, physical and psychometric examinations, and observational records by parents and teachers. The investigator found that the child frequently identified himself and other members of his family with the dolls; that he changed the roles frequently; that actual and fantasied home-life situations were dramatized; that there were well-individualized fantasy expressions in the experimental situations; that the outstanding single reaction in the doll play was aggressive behavior. Positive affective reactions expressed verbally were not common. No statistical analysis was made. Considering the amount of behavioral data available on these children, disappointingly little attempt was made to determine the diagnostic value of the projective devices or to relate the findings of the play situations to the wealth of behavioral and examination data available to the author.

Well-adjusted, maladjusted, and delinquent children were studied by Ackerman (1938) with respect to the kind of constructive or destructive play behavior they displayed in individual play situations. The groups were not, however, differentiated by the kind of behavior displayed.

Bryan (1940) investigated the free play technique with a view to determining its validity and reliability in the personality study of preschool children. Narrative records of 44 children in free play with doll materials were obtained. Attempts to identify the children or to make personality ratings on the basis of the play records yielded only slight success. The several play records of each child were matched correctly in slightly more than half the cases. Bryan concludes that most of the children showed a marked degree of consistency of behavior from one play situation to the next, but that the play situations were too limited to present a recognizable picture of the child's personality.

Dramatic play of preschool children was investigated by Baruch (1940). Fifteen minutes of play with dolls and doll furniture were allowed. The dolls represented the child's family. The experimenter played a passive role. A running record of the child's behavior was taken. The experimenter reports that the expression of aggression toward various family members appeared in 32 of the 46 interviews. Some hint as to the cause of the frequent aggression may come from the procedure itself. In the middle of the interview, the experimenter said, "You can be as mean as you like; you can do anything you feel like doing." This bit of encouragement may have done more than free the child of inhibitions in his play, as the experimenter intended; it may have suggested aggressive behavior that otherwise would not have occurred. The investigator felt that this kind of play revealed many sidelights on family situations which helped the staff in understanding the emotional living of the children. From the report there is no evidence, however, of any attempt to determine the degree of correspondence between the aggressive manifestations and the actual family behavior and experiences of the children.

Lerner and Murphy (1941) describe their experience with projective play techniques with nursery school children, using free play, group play, readiness for destructive play, and active play techniques. Validation was attempted by comparing a

child with himself in different parts of the play situation and in a number of home and school situations. The authors stress the need for using fundamentally different types of projective material to get different facts of the child's fantasy life and for putting together all the material to make a total picture of the child.

If projective products are really the result of, or are related to, the needs and drives and feelings of the individual, a change in the need or drive or feeling should be accompanied by a corresponding change in the projective product. Frank (1939) has said that experimentally produced personality disturbances can be diagnosed by their expressions in subsequent play forms. A test of this possibility is provided in the following investigations, all of which have an experimentally created condition, followed by a projective technique for detecting the induced condition.

Sanford (1936) observed the effects of abstinence from food upon the verbal responses of a group of 10 children, 4 to 11 years of age, to 24 words related to food and to ambiguous pictures of persons engaged in some kind of activity. Examinations were made immediately before lunch and a short time after breakfast. The subjects gave more food responses immediately before a meal than after a meal.

Wright (1941) found a significant correlation between the degree of experimentally created conflict present in the child and the degree to which themes of destruction, punishment, and self-justification were used in picture-stimulated stories. The conflict created in this experiment required the child to choose between a generous or a selfish toy selection.

Essentially the same technique was used by Bellak (1942) with seven college students who were given ten of the pictures of the Thematic Apperception Test and asked to tell stories about them. Five of the stories were told by the subject without comment by the experimenter; each of the other five stories was followed by sharp criticism from the experimenter. The stories under the two conditions were then analyzed as to the number of words connoting aggression, the assumption being that the subjects resented the criticism and would project their feelings into the stories. Using a modification of the analysis of variance, the author found a difference between the two sets of stories

which was significant between the 1 per cent and 2 per cent levels.

From the foregoing reports it appears that projective techniques have made available valuable insights into personality which have served as effective therapeutic aids, which have some relation to past and present behavior, and which may reveal some clues predictive of future behavior. The status of projective techniques is still uncertain, but the techniques suggest sufficient validity to warrant further inquiry into their value as tools of science.

IV. DESIGN OF THE EXPERIMENT

THE PROBLEM

The problem of this research is, first, to study the nature of parental authority and discipline relations and their correlates in the behavior and attitudes of preschool-age children, and second, to study the validity of projective data on this aspect of the lives of young children.

Analysis of this area of the personal lives of the child and his parents is full of methodological difficulties. Systematic and detailed observational records of the overt behavior of the family, even if feasible, would not give wholly adequate data. The effect of the observer upon family behavior and the inaccessibility of complex attitudes and behavioral relationships within the family would seriously limit the information obtained. There are at present no wholly satisfactory techniques by which family relationships can be studied.

The present experimental plan has coordinated several approaches, in the hope of avoiding unwarranted conclusions based on flimsy or biased evidence and of gaining more relevant information than would be possible with the use of one measure alone.

Basic considerations in determining the procedure were (1) to obtain measures of the home variable in terms of its psychological meaning for the participants, (2) to secure measures of structure and interrelationships in the authority and discipline area, and (3) to show how these variables are related to the child's behavior. Ideally, the study would have included both cross-sectional and longitudinal data to allow measurements of status and of changes and sequences in parent and child behavior and attitudes. Although the data in this research are primarily cross-sectional in nature, several approximations to longitudinal data have also been made by obtaining data concerning authority and discipline relations in the parents' childhoods, and by utilizing data on the child at two periods in his preschool life (at preschool entrance and at the time of testing).

THE SUBJECTS

The subjects of this investigation were 43 children enrolled in the nursery school and kindergarten of the University of Min-

nesota Institute of Child Welfare, and their parents. There were 19 boys and 24 girls, ranging in age from 3 years 10 months to 5 years 10 months (average age: 4 years 8 months; *SD* 6 months), with an average IQ on the revised Stanford-Binet of 127 (*SD* 16). The children came from urban homes and represented a select social, economic, and educational sample of the population. The parents belonged chiefly to the professional, business, and managerial levels of the Minnesota Occupational Scale. A considerable variety of nationality backgrounds was represented, including American-born German, Scandinavian, English, Irish, Scottish, Czechoslovak, Italian, French, Russian, and Jewish stocks. The average number of years of education of the mothers was 16 (*SD* 2 years) and of the fathers 17 (*SD* 2.6 years). There were nine Ph.D.'s and three M.D.'s among the fathers, two Ph.D.'s and one M.D. among the mothers. With a few exceptions the parents were in early middle age; the average age of the mothers was 35 years (*SD* 5.4 years) and of the fathers 38 years (*SD* 6.2 years). Many of the families were non-completed, and therefore the present family size is smaller than it will be eventually for this group of parents. The average number of children per family was 1.86; the average age of subjects and their siblings was 4½ years. The majority of the children studied were first-born or "only" children. They were predominantly healthy. In none were there marked behavior problems. In every respect the group constituted a normal population of upper middle-class urban society.

THE PROCEDURE

The data of this study were obtained through questionnaire and interview reports, ratings, tests, experimental situations, and projective techniques. The data came from the parents, the teachers, and the children.

DATA FROM THE PARENTS

The questionnaire-interview method of obtaining information from the parents was chosen as the most feasible approach. For this purpose a questionnaire of 127 items relating to authority and discipline was composed. The items consisted of short declarative statements. Each statement was checked by the parent in terms of frequency (*usually, sometimes, rarely*) or intensity (*very much, somewhat, very little*) as it best described the parent's situation. The items were chosen to cover

the following principles and methods of authority and discipline in the home: *

- Philosophy of authority and discipline
- Strictness or laxness of disciplinary policies
- Severity or mildness of punishments
- Amount and areas of parental supervision
- Friction over discipline (mother-father, parent-child)
- Mother's versus father's role in home discipline
- Parents' rapport with child
- Sibling differences related to discipline and intrafamily rapport
- Techniques of discipline
- Effectiveness of discipline

The first half of the questionnaire dealt with authority and discipline in the *parent's* childhood; the second half dealt with authority and discipline in the *child's* home life. Items in the first half of the questionnaire were paired with items in the second half of the questionnaire. The parent checking the questionnaire answered (1) concerning his own mother and father and siblings, and (2) concerning himself and his spouse and his child. (See the questionnaire in Appendix I.)

In addition to the multiple choice statements, the questionnaire included two subjective questions, in which the parents were asked to compare the authority and discipline of their own childhood and the situation with which they now confront their child, and to tell if possible the origin of the differences between them.

The questionnaire was answered by both parents in their own home and in the presence of the experimenter. This method prevented collaboration between the parents and assured the experimenter of complete returns. The questionnaire was followed by an interview with both parents together, in which they were encouraged to report further on the topics of authority and discipline, and to bring out peculiarities of their own situations. Immediately after the interview the experimenter, using a seven-point scale, rated the home on the degree of congeniality and compatibility as evidenced in the interview situation.

Another source of information about the home was the data given by the parent at the time he enrolled his child in the preschool. This information included not only routine facts of age, occupation, education, and the like, but also a description of the

* These categories follow in part the variables discussed by Champney (1941b).

child's activities in the home, the kind of disciplinary methods used, and special difficulties or needs of the child.

Reliance upon parents' reports of their own behavior entails some dangers. Unintentional as well as conscious errors in the reports, if present to any considerable degree, will invalidate the data. It is impossible to determine directly the exact magnitude of these errors, but indirect evaluations can be made. Willing cooperation from the parents, one prerequisite for frank reports, was obtained by the exercise of tact and patience in presenting the problem to them. The parents did not sign the questionnaire, and the interviewer assured them that their reports were confidential and that, after their questionnaires had been added to other data on their child, all identification of child and parent would be removed. Comments from the parents concerning their efforts to be frank gave added evidence as to the infrequency of intentional errors.

A more serious problem of validity arises in the operation of the parents' unintentional modifications of their reports in the direction of desirability, and in lack of knowledge on the part of the parents concerning their own behavior in the authority and discipline areas. These difficulties should operate at a minimum in a select and cooperative intellectual group. However, Goodenough's (1931) findings in her study of anger in young children must be heeded here. At the beginning of her study parents were asked to check from a list of methods for controlling anger in children the ones they usually employed. Then they were asked to keep a day-by-day record of the occasion and circumstances of each anger outburst in their child and of the kind of discipline used on each occasion. These records showed little agreement with the original check lists of types of discipline usually used. These discrepancies appeared in a population equal to that of the present study in educational and occupational qualifications.

Although the reasons for the discrepancies are not entirely clear, they may occur because the authority and discipline aspects of the home involve little in the way of a conscious training program by most parents. Parents handle the discipline situation quickly, automatically, without planning or knowing how it is done. The menace of this deficiency in the data led in the present study to the consideration of another source of data on the parents' behavior. It was argued that if the parent

is not always able to report his own behavior accurately, perhaps the child who *experiences* the parent's behavior and attitudes is a more faithful reporter. To this end, data on the parents were secured from the children through interviews with each child and through projective techniques. These will be described in detail in the following sections.

Even by a multiple approach to the psychological home environment, many important intangible factors in the personal relationships have been omitted. The parent's tone of voice, the distribution of his comments to the child, and his general attitude of spontaneity, buoyancy, tension, or gloom contribute significantly to the atmosphere; yet they and other factors like them have not been measured.

DATA FROM THE CHILDREN

Data on each child were obtained in interview situations in which the experimenter saw each child individually on two occasions. Each interview lasted approximately an hour and a quarter. The interviews were separated in time by an interval of four to five weeks. Individual cases of absences from school sometimes necessitated longer intervals. Since it was felt unwise to take a child immediately after his return from an illness, three of the children had their second interviews eight weeks after the first. The children were interviewed in the mornings, usually during free play periods. The room in which they were interviewed contained a child's table and two child-sized chairs, an adult desk and chair, and several large boxes of blocks and toys.

Interview I. The first interview consisted of an oral questionnaire—the child's description of his family—and two types of projective techniques. It was conducted in the following manner: Rapport was established with each child before beginning the research procedure. The rapport period consisted of play and conversation between experimenter and child until the child was at ease and congenial. The initial period was terminated by the experimenter, who explained that she had some questions she wanted the child to answer. Since the children were accustomed to test situations, they accepted the situation willingly.

The oral questionnaire consisted of 53 items requiring only short answers but allowing elaborations. It gave the child con-

siderable freedom to answer as he wished and to say whatever occurred to him. The items dealt with the child's relations with his parents. Sixty per cent of the questions paralleled items in the parent questionnaire. The questionnaire-interview was informal and was made as much like a conversation as possible, allowing the child to proceed as he wished. The experimenter used the same wording of the questions, however, for all the children. The questions were given in an order and at a rate suited to the individual child. If the child became restless or resistant, the questionnaire was interrupted for some more pleasurable play activity or child-initiated conversation and was resumed when the child expressed willingness to continue the questions. The oral questionnaire is given in full in Appendix II.

Following the questionnaire the child was told that the experimenter had some games for him. The "games" were two types of projective techniques, picture identifications and doll play.

Projective techniques in the present experiment were used to obtain further information about the child's perception of himself and his family, and to determine the effectiveness of projective techniques in revealing data which are verifiable from other sources. As has been demonstrated in the literature on projective techniques, one of the weaknesses in their use as scientific instruments is the frequent reliance upon purely surface evidence for the demonstration of relationships between the projective products and personality; that is, if in doll play a doll which the child has called "father" is beaten or dismembered in the course of the play, the investigators have concluded that there exists for that child a "father hostility." In few instances have the investigators gone farther to determine by other means the actual father-child relations existing in the child's life.

For the present research the following criteria were adhered to in devising the projective situations:

1. The situation must be simple enough to enable the child to comprehend it.
2. The situation must include elements common to his experience.
3. The situation must be related to significant areas in the lives of all young children.

4. The situation must be related to areas in which other verifying data are available.

5. The situation must allow individualized responses and at the same time be adaptable to objective, quantitative analysis.

The picture technique was designed as follows: Thirty-four pairs of pictures, matched in all features except one variable, were mounted in pairs on white backgrounds $8\frac{1}{2}$ by 11 inches in size and assembled in notebook form, so that as the experimenter turned the pages the child responded to the consecutive pairs of pictures until the entire book had been seen.

The picture series consisted of two parts: pairs of pictures of children with parents and pairs of pictures of parents. The specific variables upon which the pictures were paired were a child with parent under pleasant circumstances versus a child with parent under unpleasant circumstances; a happy mother versus a cross or unhappy mother; a happy father versus a cross or unhappy father; and a mother and father together under pleasant circumstances versus a mother and father together under unpleasant circumstances. Identical pictures of mothers and fathers were given to both sexes. The pictures differed for girls and boys wherever a child appeared, but they were as nearly alike as possible except for the sex of the child in the picture. (See examples in Figure 1.)

The directions for the child in responding to the pictures were: "Here are some pictures to look at. They are pictures about little girls [boys] and about mothers and fathers. Let's see if you can tell me which of them is most like you or like your mother and father."

Two practice pictures were given to make certain the child understood what was expected of him. In the first practice picture the identification called for a choice between a boy and a girl, the assumption being that a well-defined difference such as this would make an easy choice situation for the child. The second practice picture required a more difficult identification. The picture pairs in this case were of a little boy and a woman for the girls, and of a little girl and a man for the boys. By means of the practice pictures it was hoped to lead the child away from the tendency of choosing pictures which had merely a superficial resemblance to the child.

The directions ("Which one is most like you? Which one feels or acts like you?") were repeated as long as seemed neces-



A



B



C

FIGURE 1.—EXAMPLES OF MATERIALS USED IN THE PICTURE SERIES

A. Child with parent under pleasant circumstances. B. Child with parent under unpleasant circumstances. C. Mother and father together under pleasant circumstances.

(Pictures by permission of Lysol Brand Disinfectant, Fletcher's Castoria, and Woodbury Soap.)

sary or until the child himself took over the situation by saying, "I'm like that one," or "That's not me," or "That's my daddy," and so on.

Doll play followed the picture series. When the pictures were completed the experimenter told the child: "I have some work to do now, but here are some toys which you may play with while I am busy." Doll furniture to equip bedrooms, bathroom, kitchen or dining room, and living room were presented. Dolls corresponding to the family constellation as described by the child in item 1 of the oral questionnaire were presented thus: "Here is a mother doll and a father doll, a little girl doll, and a big brother [depending on the particular child's family]. You may do anything you like with these toys. You may do whatever you want to do."

The dolls were 2 to 6 inches in height, with painted bisque heads and cotton-stuffed bodies, arms, and legs. This allowed considerable flexibility and bending of the dolls, but at the same time there was enough firmness to permit the child to stand them upright. The dolls' proportions corresponded to those of children and adults. The dolls were dressed in appropriate costumes, which could be removed by the child if he wished. The doll-sized furniture was made of wood. The dolls were placed in a row on the table by the experimenter as the instructions were being given. The furniture was presented without comment about the various pieces and without organization into specific room arrangements.

After giving the instructions, the experimenter left the child at the small table with the toys and went to the adult-sized desk where she could watch the child carefully without his being continually aware of her presence. Since the desk of the experimenter was adjacent to, and higher than, the child's table, close observation of the play was relatively easy to manage, while to the child the experimenter appeared to be busily writing.

Running accounts of the child's actions and verbalizations were made. The recording was facilitated by the use of a system of symbols to express the various kinds of manipulations and reactions.

About twenty minutes were allowed for the doll play, but the subject was permitted to terminate the play sooner if he desired. If he had not stopped playing at the end of the allotted time,

the experimenter suggested putting the toys away. The child was then told that it was time to return to the other children and that he could come again another day to play more games with the experimenter. The games were extremely popular, so that each time the experimenter entered the room several children clamored for a "turn."

Interview II. The second interview consisted of a repetition of the doll play and the picture identification, plus free associations and three experimental situations designed to measure the child's compliance with adult directions.

The compliance situations were planned to vary in the amount of power exercised by the adult and the freedom of execution allowed the child. In situation I a very mild authority is exercised by the adult; the child is simply invited to wait for the experimenter. Restriction of the child's freedom is implied but not enforced. Situation II requires continued compliance from the child over a period of time and in a specific activity with very limited freedom. In situation III the adult power is uncompromising in requiring an unreasonable, unquestioned response from the child. All the commands given by the adult are positive commands. The situations are described below. The interview proceeded as follows:

In compliance situation I the experimenter brought a child into the room, sat down at the desk, and said to the child, "You may sit down here," pointing to one of the chairs at the child's table. The table was bare, but the doll equipment and other toys were in sight on the experimenter's desk. Then the experimenter paid no more discernible attention to the child but began writing. With a stop watch before her, the experimenter recorded the child's behavior by half-minute intervals for two and a half minutes. This situation presumably gave an indication of the child's compliance in a situation of mild adult pressure. After the two and a half minutes, the child was given the dolls and furniture and instructions for doll play as in the first interview.

Following the doll play came the identification of pictures, again as in the first interview.

Free associations by the child about his mother and father were next. These associations can hardly be called free in the traditional sense, for they were often long-deliberated responses from the children. Preliminary experimentation on preschool

children had shown that it is difficult to get immediate verbal responses from young children which correspond to the free associations given by adults. The technique employed here was to ask the child, "Can you tell me what a mother is? What is a mother?" The same questions were repeated for father. The child was urged to continue until at least four associations had been given.

Then followed compliance situations II and III.

Compliance situation II required the child to draw twenty faces on twenty pieces of paper 5 inches square. The only direction was, "Now I want you to draw a face for me on this piece of paper." When the child finished the face, he was given another piece of paper with the same directions. The paper was taken each time from a tall pile, so that it looked to the child as though he were expected to use all the papers in the pile. The experimenter recorded the drawing time for each face and the child's remarks about it. If the child did not immediately begin to draw a face, the experimenter repeated the directions at fifteen-second intervals until five commands had been given. If the child did not comply after five commands the situation was terminated.

In compliance situation III the experimenter commanded the child, "Now lie down on the floor." The tone and manner in this case were stern and uncompromising, without the quality of the polite requests made in the previous situations. If the child did not comply with the command, it was repeated five times at fifteen-second intervals before the situation was terminated. The child's responses were recorded.

Before leaving the research room, the child was allowed to play with anything he liked, so that if feelings of resentment or anger had been aroused in the course of the compliance tests, there would be a chance to regain rapport with the child in the play that followed.

DATA FROM THE TEACHERS

In addition to the interviews and test situations, data on the children were obtained from the kindergarten and nursery school teachers. The children were rated on a graphic scale of twenty behavior patterns relating to personal-social behavior of the children in preschool. Each behavior item to be rated was indicated by a horizontal line, each end of the line representing one

of the extremes of the behavior in question. These end points are described on the scales. The ratings were made by checking on the behavior line the position that best described the child. All the children were rated on one trait before the next trait was considered. At the top of each page of the rating blanks was the description of the behavior. At the beginning of each rating line was the name of the child to be rated. (The rating scale is given in Appendix III.)

PREVIEW OF ANALYSIS

Analysis of the data obtained in this investigation includes an analysis of the structure of authority and discipline in a culturally homogeneous sample of urban American population, as it is perceived by the parent and child participants. The present structure is related to the structure of a generation ago and to present child-care standards and philosophies of authority. Parent and child perceptions are compared. The child's reactions to intrafamily relationships are emphasized. Variables of family behavior are studied in relation to attitudes and behavior of the child. The contributions of two kinds of projective techniques are analyzed and evaluated. The applications and theoretical implications of the findings are discussed.

V. ANALYSIS OF PARENTS' QUESTIONNAIRE-INTERVIEW DATA

PARENTS' REPORTS ON THE DISCIPLINE AND AUTHORITY RELATIONS OF THEIR OWN CHILDHOOD

There have been frequent speculations in the literature concerning the effects of childhood experiences upon adult behavior. These speculations led to the inclusion in this study of the parents' reports on the kind of authority and discipline they experienced in their own childhoods, and a comparison of these reports with the kind of discipline they now give their children.

If the experimenter's primary aim is that of comparing the actual behavior of the two generations of parents, relying upon parents' memories of childhood experiences is less satisfactory than obtaining measures directly at the time the behavior occurred. The fallibility of the adult's reports on childhood experiences, as well as reports on his own behavior, has been demonstrated in many investigations. These considerations must be faced in analyzing the present data. However, of no less importance than the determination of the physically real childhood situation is the determination of the meaning which the parent's childhood has for him at present, including possible memory errors and biases, and the relation of his psychological past to his behavior now as a parent. The present data were analyzed with this latter emphasis in mind.

Of three possible hypotheses—that the discipline atmosphere of the grandparent generation is (1) positively related, (2) negatively related, or (3) unrelated to the parents' present disciplinary attitudes and techniques—the first, a positive relationship, is supported, though not strongly, by the coefficient of contingency between the questionnaire responses of parents concerning the discipline in their own childhood and the discipline now given their children. Using a threefold table (categories: *usually*, *sometimes*, *seldom*; or *very much*, *somewhat*, *very little*) and correcting for grouping, a coefficient equal to .38 was obtained ($\sigma_c = \pm .0043$). There is thus some tendency for the parent to use disciplinary techniques similar to those he remembers having experienced in his childhood.

Since the correlation between the two generations falls far

short of perfect, the amount and kind of variation between the two generations (as the parent sees it at present) in discipline philosophy and practices were investigated. Two kinds of analyses were made: grandparent and parent generations were compared (1) on five scales of authority and discipline atmosphere and (2) on responses to individual, parallel items on the parents' inventory.

The first analysis was made by comparing scores of the two generations on a number of atmosphere scales composed of items from the parents' inventory. (Inventory items were assigned to the scales by two judges working independently. The dimension with which each scale was concerned was specifically defined by the experimenter. The judges were then asked to assign each item of the parents' inventory to one of these categories, described below, or to an unclassified category for items which did not fit any one of the six scales. The percentage of agreement between the judges on the total number of items classified was 96 per cent.)

The number of items varies from scale to scale. In the following descriptions of the scales the inventory items composing each scale are identified by the numbers within the parentheses. (The inventory is given in Appendix I.)

1. PHILOSOPHY OF AUTHORITY. Autocratic-democratic. * (3, 8, 51, 65, 75, 79, 116, 117.) *Criteria*.—Autocratic atmosphere: (a) Parent determines all policies. (b) Activities of child are dictated by parent for immediate situation, so future course of action of parent is uncertain for child. Democratic atmosphere: (a) Policies are a matter of family decision. Child is encouraged and "drawn out." (b) Child is given perspective by explanations of course of action.

2. PARENTAL RESTRICTIONS. Strict; firm-lax, easygoing. (7, 10, 22, 24, 25, 32, 38, 50, 74, 76, 108, 110, 112.) *Criteria*.—Strict, firm discipline: (a) Restriction boundaries on child's behavior firmly maintained by parent. (b) Child can break through parent's restrictions only with great difficulty; restrictions hold against child's attempts to break through. Lax, easygoing discipline: (a) Restriction boundaries on child's behavior weakly or incompletely maintained by parent. (b) Child can break through parent's restrictions with relative ease; restrictions give way with child's force against them.

3. SEVERITY OF PUNISHMENTS. Severe-mild. (39, 49, 64, 67, 78, 97.) *Criteria*.—Severe: Parent perceives punishment given to child as severe. Mild: Parent perceives punishment given to child as mild.

4. PARENT-CHILD RAPPORT. Good-poor. (Separate scales for

* See Lippitt (1940) for definitions of autocratic and democratic leader techniques.

mother and father. 20, 44, 48, 52, 54, 62, 70, 71, 86, 99, 109, 113, 118, 119; 4, 41, 46, 52, 54, 55, 56, 71, 85, 86, 113, 115, 118, 119.) *Criteria*.—Good rapport: (a) Parent gives attention to child's problems and activities; joins in child's interest. (b) Child gives confidences to parent. (c) Give-and-take between parent and child in positive affection relationships. (d) Absence of unpleasant emotional relationships between parent and child. Poor rapport: (a) Parent gives little attention to child's problems and activities; does not share child's interests. (b) Child withholds confidences from parent. (c) Absence of positive affection relationships between parent and child. (d) Presence of unpleasant emotional relationships between parent and child.

5. *RELATIVE RESPONSIBILITY OF MOTHER AND FATHER IN DISCIPLINE OF CHILD*. Equal responsibility—unequal responsibility. (5, 21, 88, 102.) *Criteria*.—Equal: (a) Mother and father share discipline responsibility equally. (b) Child equally compliant to both parents. Unequal: (a) One parent takes major responsibility for child's discipline. (b) Child more compliant to one parent than other.

6. *SIBLING RELATIONSHIPS*. Harmonious—inharmonious. (26, 27, 29, 30, 81, 82, 83, 84.) *Criteria*.—Harmonious: Compatible relationships among siblings. Inharmonious: Incompatible relationships among siblings.

A score was obtained on each of the scales by assigning to each item a value of 2, 1, or 0, according to the parent's response of *very much*, *somewhat*, *very little*; or *usually*, *sometimes*, *rarely*.

Generation differences on the atmosphere scales and on the individual items of the parents' inventory are discussed below.* Results of the atmosphere scale comparisons are summarized in Figure 2; comparisons of individual inventory items are given in Table 1.

PHILOSOPHY OF AUTHORITY IN PARENT AND GRANDPARENT GENERATIONS

Differences between the grandparent and parent generations indicate a decrease in the authoritarian pattern of parents and an increase in the "equality" status of the child in the family. The mean scores on the autocratic-democratic scale differed significantly ($t=5.37$),[†] with the parents scoring in the direction of more democratic behavior than the grandparents. This trend is shown consistently in each of the paired items of this variable. (See items 3, 79; 8, 75; 51, 116; 65, 117 in Table 1.)

* The sixth scale was not used in this comparison.

† Significance of a difference in the means of related measures. See Lindquist (1940), pp. 58-59.




FIGURE 2.—COMPARISON OF DISCIPLINE IN PARENT AND GRANDPARENT GENERATIONS
Average raw scores on the scales of home atmosphere have been translated into percentage scores of the possible total score on each scale. The meaning of the limits of each scale is given in the figure. Grandparent and parent generations are compared. The statistically significant differences, determined by the *t* test for related measures, are reported at the bottom of the figure.

PARENTAL RESTRICTIONS AND SEVERITY OF PUNISHMENTS

The changes in strictness and severity of discipline are not clear-cut. Mean scale scores for the two generations do not differ significantly. Mothers of the two generations changed very little, but there are some evidences of changes in fathers in these respects. More fathers of the last than of the present generation of parents are reported as usually severe (items 49,

78, *CR* 2.83), as never strict (items 7, 74, *CR* 4.48), and as never mild (items 67, 97, *CR* 4.84) in discipline, and as frequently babying the child (items 69, 120, *CR* 3.05). These rather contradictory results may be symptomatic of a tendency for fathers of the present generation to take a more realistic and less extreme attitude toward child discipline problems as they assume more responsibility in child care than did the past generation of fathers.

TABLE 1.—COMPARISON OF PARENTS' AND GRANDPARENTS' DISCIPLINARY STANDARDS AND PRACTICES BASED ON MATCHED QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS

Item	Response*	Parents		Grandparents		CR§
		N†	%‡	N	%	
Parents like to have the child bring his playmates into the house to play (1, 77)	+	79	81	80	55	3.66
Child has voice in family plans (3, 79)	—	79	14	79	34	2.94
Child confides in father (4, 119)	+	37	62	75	25	3.92
Child confides in father (4, 119)	—	37	5	75	50	6.88
Punishment is given by mother (5, 102)	0	80	54	80	22	4.42
Child is expected to be neat and tidy at home (6, 114)	+	79	33	79	51	2.34
Father is strict and firm (7, 74)	—	37	3	75	29	4.48
"A child should be seen and not heard" (8, 75)	+	79	4	78	20	3.17
"A child should be seen and not heard" (8, 75)	—	79	77	78	49	3.79
Child obeys mother (9, 96)	+	43	65	80	81	1.88
Mother gives in (10, 76)	+	43	7	80	11	.77
Child is punished by spanking (11, 89)	+	79	2	80	19	3.44
Child is punished by isolating (13, 90)	+	79	22	80	4	3.53
Child is punished by isolating (13, 90)	—	79	26	80	74	6.95
Child is punished by depriving him of privileges (14, 91)	—	79	26	80	36	1.37
Child is punished by shaming him (15, 92)	—	78	91	79	48	6.63
Parents bribe child (16, 93)	—	79	63	80	76	1.80
Child is punished by letting him suffer natural results of his misconduct (17, 94)	—	80	22	79	34	1.70
Parents threaten child with withdrawal of their love (18, 95)	+	80	1	80	4	1.22
Parents punish child by frightening him (19, 103)	0	80	3	80	18	3.20
Parents punish child by frightening him (19, 103)	—	80	97	80	82	3.20
Child confides in mother (20, 119)	+	43	86	80	51	4.60
Child confides in mother (20, 119)	—	43	0	80	23	4.89
Punishment is given by father (21, 88)	0	75	83	76	34	7.06
Punishment is given by father (21, 88)	—	75	14	76	53	5.58
Mother is strict and firm (22, 74)	—	43	12	79	16	.61
Child obeys father (23, 96)	+	37	59	76	84	2.74
Father gives in (24, 76)	—	37	57	74	64	.71
Mother is easy on child (25, 110)	—	43	19	79	31	1.51

TABLE 1.—*Continued*

Item	Response*	Parents		Grandparents		CR§
		N†	%‡	N	%	
Household is planned around child (31, 100)	+	80	71	80	46	3.32
Household is planned around child (31, 100)	—	80	0	80	18	4.19
Father is easy on child (32, 110)	—	37	19	79	30	1.32
Child has tantrums to get his own way (33, 105)	—	79	30	80	70	5.50
Child sulks and pouts to get his own way (34, 106)	—	79	49	79	40	1.14
Child does not get his own way with parents (35, 104)	+	78	37	80	51	1.79
Child bargains with parents to get his own way (37, 107)	+	80	26	79	18	1.22
Child ignores parents' orders (38, 108)	—	80	71	80	85	2.17
Mother's punishments are mild (39, 97)	—	43	0	60	12	2.85
Father "pushes" child (40, 98)	+	37	54	79	17	4.02
Father "pushes" child (40, 98)	—	37	3	79	49	7.30
Child loves father (41, 85)	—	80	0	76	9	2.70
Mother "babies" child (42, 120)	—	43	44	80	65	2.28
Parents supervise child (43, 101)	—	79	9	80	16	1.34
Child fears mother (44, 109)	—	79	87	80	69	2.81
Parents answer questions frankly, patiently (45, 111)	+	80	88	80	48	6.01
Mother's punishments are predictable (47, 87)	+	43	60	79	78	2.04
Child loves mother (48, 99)	+	80	90	78	77	2.24
Father's punishments are severe (49, 78)	+	37	5	74	22	2.83
Child has his own way (50, 112)	—	80	18	80	31	1.95
Parents expect unquestioning obedience (51, 116)	+	80	12	80	41	4.40
Parents expect unquestioning obedience (51, 116)	—	80	60	80	30	4.34
Child resents punishments (52, 113)	+	80	10	80	16	1.13
Mother shows love for child (53, 118)	+	43	95	80	71	4.00
Parents leave child's questions unanswered (54, 86)	—	79	80	80	44	5.04
Father plays with child (55, 71)	—	37	11	75	39	3.69
Child fears father (56, 115)	—	77	86	75	64	3.24
Father's punishments are predictable (57, 87)	—	37	8	74	38	4.16
Mother "pushes" child (59, 98)	—	43	9	80	34	3.68
Father shows love for child (63, 118)	—	37	70	74	55	1.58
Mother's punishments are severe (64, 78)	+	40	52	80	63	1.17
Parents explain reasons for punishment (65, 117)	+	79	82	79	62	2.87
Father's punishments are mild (67, 97)	—	37	3	72	33	4.84
Father "babies" child (69, 120)	+	37	0	75	11	3.05
Mother plays with child (70, 71)	—	43	2	80	28	4.81

* Response categories are represented by symbols: *very much* and *usually* are recorded as +, *somewhat* and *sometimes* as 0, *very little* and *rarely* as —.

† N refers to total number of parents answering item.

‡ % refers to percentage of total giving indicated + or — response.

§ Significance of difference between percentages.

RELATIVE RESPONSIBILITY OF MOTHER AND FATHER
IN DISCIPLINE OF CHILD

There is a change in the direction of greater participation in the discipline program by fathers of the present generation than by fathers of the preceding generation ($t=1.89$; for items 21, 88, *CR*'s 7.06, 5.58).

PARENT-CHILD RAPPORT

From the foregoing trends one might venture a prediction as to the quality of rapport that is characteristic of the two generations. A less dictatorial quality of discipline, a greater interest shown by fathers, a greater consideration of the child's needs and interests should lead to an improvement in parent-child rapport. There is evidence in support of this theory: The mean score of the parents is significantly higher than that of the grandparents ($t=4.59$) on the scale of parent-child rapport. Results on the individual items are as follows: Children of this generation share confidences with their parents more frequently than did those of the past generation (items 4, 119, *CR* 3.92; items 20, 119, *CR*'s 4.60, 4.89). There are significant decreases in the present generation in the number of parents who rarely or never play with their children (items 55, 71, *CR* 3.69; items 70, 71, *CR* 4.81), and in the number of children who are afraid of their fathers (items 56, 115, *CR* 3.24) and mothers (items 44, 109, *CR* 2.81). There is an increase in the present generation in affection shown by parents toward their children (items 53, 118, *CR* 4.00, by mothers; items 63, 118, *CR* 1.58, by fathers), and in affection shown by children toward their parents (items 41, 85, *CR* 2.70, toward fathers; items 48, 99, *CR* 2.24, toward mothers).

PARENTAL TECHNIQUES OF DISCIPLINE

According to parents' reports certain changes in punishment techniques have taken place in the two generations: Spanking the child (items 11, 39, *CR* 3.44) is less frequent; isolating the child (items 13, 90, *CR* 6.95) is more frequent; shaming the child (items 15, 92, *CR* 6.63) and frightening (warning) the child (items 19, 103, *CR* 3.20) are less frequent now than in the past generation. Also, the child's use of temper tantrums (items 33, 105, *CR* 5.50) as a means of getting his way was more effective with the grandparent generation than with present-day parents.

PARENTS' EVALUATIONS OF DISCIPLINE RELATIONS

In addition to the scale scores and the item-by-item comparisons of the discipline of the two generations, the parents' descriptive accounts of these areas were analyzed. The parents were asked to compare or contrast the discipline they now exercise over their children with the discipline of their own childhoods; and, where the two areas differed, they were asked to give the reasons for the differences.

These descriptions can be thought of as an alternate form of the objective questions of the inventory. In this way a rough estimate can be made of the consistency of the parents' responses. The trends in the two reports are very consistent. In both reports the past generation is described as more autocratic than the present generation of parents, more lacking in respect for the child's personality and independence, and giving more of the responsibility for discipline to the mother than to the father (Table 2).

TABLE 2.—PARENTS' EVALUATIONS OF DISCIPLINE IN THE GRANDPARENT GENERATION

Evaluation	Parents Reporting the Characteristic	
	N	%
Unreasonable, unjust, unexplained, autocratic.....	36	46
Strict, severe	14	18
Lack of understanding, attention, affection.....	11	14
Parents emotional in giving discipline; emotional atmosphere....	17	22
Little respect for child, little independence or responsibility.....	18	23
Religious and sex taboos used in discipline.....	9	11
Nagging and scolding	9	11
Spankings	11	14
"Babying" and overaffection.....	13	16
Parental disagreements and inconsistencies.....	11	14
Discipline the responsibility of mother only.....	11	14
Large families; often older children disciplined younger children	13	16
Little time for play with children.....	7	9
Discipline not governed by scientific knowledge of child care.....	15	19
One parent out of home; all discipline by one parent.....	9	11

Several variables characteristic of discipline in the past generation have been dropped completely by the present generation of parents. The family constellations are so different in the two generations as to produce some distinctly different problems of control (Table 2). Disciplinary control exercised by older siblings over the younger children appears to be absent in these children's homes. Religious and sex taboos which en-

tered into the discipline of the parents are not reported in the discipline of the children. Disciplinary methods determined by scientific standards are reported for this generation of parents but not for the past generation of parents.

SUMMARY

Comparisons of parent and grandparent generations have shown a general trend in discipline in the direction of standards and principles which child psychologists have advocated, toward greater respect for the child's personality, and toward less autocratic, unreasonable, and emotional discipline. These results may be viewed as evidence of the degree to which scientific principles have come into use in the home and have been accepted as part of the home culture pattern for the population represented in this study.

There are no reports in the literature in which similar comparisons have been made. Symonds (1939) and MacFarlane (1938) have indicated their belief that there is an influence of parents' childhood experiences upon parents' disciplinary techniques. MacFarlane seems to feel that the parent makes a correction for the techniques that he disliked in his own childhood discipline experiences. Symonds does not indicate the direction of relationships between parents' childhood experiences and the disciplinary methods they employ as parents. No conclusive data are given. Further research is needed in which other methods of obtaining these data are used and in which other levels of the population are studied, before we can describe precisely the extent and nature of the cultural changes from the past generation to the present generation of parents with respect to home discipline.

One may justifiably ask concerning these data: Are the generation differences reported here true changes, or are they differences which result partly from a real cultural change and partly from the bias of the reporters, who were responding first as the receivers of the discipline and second as the givers of the discipline? If there is a consistent bias for receivers to perceive the discipline as more unreasonable than the givers of the same discipline, this bias should show up in the comparison of the children's descriptions of home atmosphere with those of the parents, where the child should perceive and report the parents as more unreasonable than the parents report

themselves to be. (This comparison is discussed on pages 44 to 46.)

PARENTS' REPORTS ON DISCIPLINE AND AUTHORITY AREAS IN THE HOME

In this analysis we are concerned with the parent's description of his authority relationships with his child. In order to estimate the validity of these descriptions, the amount of agreement between children's and parents' reports and the amount of agreement between the independent reports of fathers and mothers on the authority relations in the home were determined.

Agreement between mothers and fathers was measured by obtaining a coefficient of contingency correlation between answers to identical questionnaire items. (Items in which differences in responses indicate differing techniques or standards of the parents are not included, because differences in such responses would not indicate a lack of validity. Items such as "The discipline my child receives is given by his father" are included. For them the father's and the mother's responses will be alike if the parents are reporting frankly on the home discipline.) Using a three-by-three table, the coefficient of contingency, corrected for grouping, obtained between mothers' and fathers' responses on 15 items was .64.* This indicates a high degree of consistency in mothers' and fathers' answers, and hence supports the validity of the reports.

Using a three-by-three table for 31 paired responses from parents and children to identical items, the coefficient of contingency, corrected for grouping, is equal to .42.†

COMPARISON OF PARENTS' AND CHILDREN'S RESPONSES

Since parents and children show less than perfect agreement in their reports of the home, it is significant to analyze the nature of the discrepancies, seeing wherein and in what direction they lie. We may test the hypothesis that parents' reports about themselves are more favorable than their children's evaluations of them; in other words, that receivers of discipline perceive it as more severe and unreasonable than it appears to the givers (see page 43). We may test, too, the hypothesis that distortion is greatest in items which threaten the indi-

* Items included were 72, 79, 80-85, 88, 99, 100, 102, 109, 114, 115.

† Items included were 71, 73-74, 76-78, 85-90, 96, 97, 101, 102, 105-15, 117-19, 127.

vidual's status as an effective parent. The parents in this sample are more aware than most of standards of child training and hence might avoid descriptions of themselves which contradict the accepted standards.

Percentage of agreement between parent and child for each of the items was calculated. When the discrepancies between parents' and children's answers were analyzed for the direction which they took, it was found that, in those questions where desirability or adherence to standards entered in, almost without exception the parent represented himself in the direction of desirability, and the child represented the parent in a less favorable or "harder" light. Comparisons showing significant differences are given in Table 3. These findings seem to sub-

TABLE 3.—COMPARISON OF PARENTS' AND CHILD'S PERCEPTIONS OF HOME RELATIONS

Behavior Variable	Number of Comparisons	Parent-Child Agreement		Parent-Child Disagreement				CR*
				Child Sees Parent as "Better" than Parent Sees Self		Child Sees Parent as "Harder" than Parent Sees Self		
		N	%	N	%	N	%	
Parent likes child to bring playmates into house	77	41	53	10	28	26	72	4.16
Child shows affection for father	37	15	41	7	32	15	68	2.55
Child shows affection for mother	43	17	40	1	4	25	96	16.94
Child is spanked	79	20	26	5	7	54	93	18.29
Child gets own way by ignoring orders	78	42	54	23	64	13	36	2.47
Parents answer questions frankly and patiently	80	58	73	6	27	16	73	3.44
Child is expected to be neat and orderly in house	77	20	26	41	72	16	28	5.23
Parent explains reasons for disciplining child.	76	35	46	6	15	35	85	8.89
Mother shows affection toward child	40	21	53	1	5	18	95	12.73
Father shows affection toward child	34	13	38	5	24	16	76	3.94
Child confides in father	37	15	41	4	18	18	82	5.53
Child confides in mother	43	26	70	5	29	12	71	2.70

* This column shows the significance of the differences between percentages of columns 5 and 7.

stantiate the hypothesis that parental reports carry at least a partial bias in the direction of desirability.

When these results are viewed in the light of the preceding discussion of grandparent discipline compared with parent discipline, the same trends appear; that is, the children (the receivers) perceive the parents (the givers) as harder than the parents report themselves; the parents (the receivers) perceive their parents (the givers) as harder than themselves.

COMPARISON OF FATHERS' AND MOTHERS' RESPONSES

Independent responses of mothers and fathers to identical items in the inventory permitted a comparison of mothers' and fathers' roles in the discipline area. The inventory items from which these comparisons were made and the percentage differences between them are given in Table 4. The percentages are based on the number of mothers (or fathers) who gave the indicated response to the item, divided by the total number of mothers (or fathers) answering the item.

Philosophy of authority. Mothers' and fathers' responses on items of philosophy of discipline do not differ significantly except in explaining to the child the reason for the discipline he receives (item 117). In this respect, mothers explain more frequently than fathers (*CR* 3.32).

TABLE 4.—COMPARISON OF MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DISCIPLINARY STANDARDS AND PRACTICES ON THE BASIS OF ANSWERS TO IDENTICAL QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS

Item	Response*	Percentage		CR
		Mothers†	Fathers†	
I play with my child (71).....	—	2	11	1.62
I am strict and firm with my child (74)	—	12	3	1.57
I enforce the rule: "A child should be seen and not heard" (75).....	+	7	0	1.78
I give in to my child (76).....	+	7	0	1.78
I like my child to bring playmates into the house to play (77).....	—	2	3	.98
The discipline I give is severe (78)....	+	3	5	.22
My child shows affection for me (85, 99)	+	93	70	2.70
I am too busy to answer my child's questions (86)	—	88	68	2.18

* Responses of *very much* and *usually* are recorded as +, *very little* and *rarely* as —.

† For the mothers, *N* is 43; for the fathers, *N* is 37. Because of occasional omissions of items *N* is in some instances reduced to 42 or 41 for the mothers and to 36 for the fathers.

TABLE 4.—*Continued*

Item	Response	Percentage		CR
		Mothers	Fathers	
My child knows ahead of time whether or not I will discipline him (87)	+	62	54	.65
I discipline my child by spanking him (89)	—	57	40	1.53
I discipline my child by isolating him (90)	+	31	11	2.28
I discipline my child by depriving him of privileges (91)	—	2	32	3.77
I discipline my child by shaming him (92)	+	0	3	1.06
I offer rewards to get him to obey (93)	+	3	5	.45
I discipline my child by letting him suffer the natural results of his bad behavior (94)	+	23	11	1.46
I discipline my child by telling him his mother or father will not love him if he is bad (95)	+	0	3	1.08
My child obeys me (96)	—	2	0	.94
The discipline I give my child is mild (97)	—	0	3	1.07
I encourage my child to forge ahead (98)	—	9	3	1.16
I supervise my child (101)	+	52	14	3.96
The discipline is given by me (102, 88)	+	22	2	2.38
I get my child to obey by warning him (103)	—	90	96	1.30
When my child does not get his own way, he gives up trying (104)	+	46	27	1.78
My child has temper tantrums to get his own way (105)	—	33	24	.89
My child sulks and pouts to get his own way (106)	—	55	43	1.07
My child bargains with me to get his own way (107)	—	18	24	.66
My child ignores my orders (108)	—	77	65	1.18
I am easygoing with my child (110)	+	28	27	.10
I answer my child's questions frankly, patiently (111)	+	95	78	2.24
I let my child have his own way (112)	+	28	3	3.38
My child resents the discipline I give him (113)	+	12	8	.60
My child is expected to be neat and tidy at home (114)	+	30	36	.56
My child fears me (115, 109)	—	90	84	.79
I expect unquestioning obedience (116)	—	70	49	1.95
I explain reasons for punishment (117)	+	95	67	3.32
I show love for my child (118)	+	95	70	3.03
My child confides in me (119)	+	86	62	2.51
I "baby" my child (120)	—	44	76	3.10

Parental restrictions and severity of discipline. Here again the reported differences between mothers and fathers are negligible. On item comparisons the only significant difference be-

tween mothers and fathers appeared in item 112: mothers more frequently than fathers allow the child to have his own way (*CR* 3.38).

Parent-child rapport. Scores on items of parent-child rapport indicate significantly better rapport between mother and child than between father and child on confidences shared with parent (item 119, *CR* 2.51), taking time to answer child's questions (item 86, *CR* 2.18), affection shown between parent and child (item 118, *CR* 3.03; items 85-99, *CR* 2.24). Differences between mothers and fathers on statements concerning playing with the child, child's fear of parent, and child's resentment of discipline are insignificant.

Techniques of punishment. Mothers and fathers show great similarity in the types of punishments given their children. In only one type is there a significant difference between mothers and fathers: Depriving the child of privileges and pleasures is less frequently used by fathers than mothers (item 91, *CR* 3.77).

The preceding comparisons do not differentiate the roles of mothers and fathers to the same extent as do the children's reports (analyzed in Chapter VI); they do, however, follow the same trend as the children's descriptions. Mothers appear in the role of the chief supervisor of the child and also as the more affectionate and yielding of the parents.

TYPES OF DISCIPLINE USED BY PARENTS OF PRESCHOOL CHILDREN

It was possible to relate some of the data on the kinds of discipline reported by the parents in the inventories to similar reports made by the mothers at the time of the child's entrance into nursery school. The two listings of punishments were not strictly comparable, since at entrance the mothers were allowed to name the kinds of punishments, whereas in the experiment they were limited to checking the punishments listed in the questionnaire. The two sets of data on home discipline for each child were compared and rated by two raters on the amount of agreement between them. The raters agreed in classifying each case in one of three broad categories: *close agreement*, *moderate agreement*, and *little or no agreement*. Sixteen cases showed close agreement, eighteen showed moderate agreement, and five showed little or no agreement in the kinds of punishments

reported. On four cases there were no entrance data. The kinds of punishments reported by the parents are shown in Figure 3.

The two sets of reports, differing in time from half a year to three years, give a clue to the permanency of discipline atmosphere in the home and to the changes in discipline procedures during the preschool years. There is an apparent increase in punishments as the children get older. Only two types (praise and rewards, and ignoring) show a decrease in usage.

If the punishments are analyzed according to the kind of influence they may be presumed to have on behavior, it is at once apparent that most of the devices are aimed at undermining the power of the child or at restricting his freedom, either physical or psychological. Spanking, depriving, isolating, frightening, shaming, withdrawing love are examples. Praise and rewards, reasoning, and similar verbal appeals (exclusive of scolding, which is also a means of reducing the child's freedom and power) are least restrictive of behavior and are least power-reductive. Allowing the child to suffer the natural results of his behavior is probably somewhat restrictive and tends to reduce the child's power, but these reductions are less dependent upon the influence of the particular adult in charge than upon physical laws and social standards of behavior.

Single types of punishments have not shown appreciable relationships to child behavior either in this or in previous studies. A more promising attack upon the problem would seem to lie in such an analysis as proposed above, namely, studying the effects upon behavior of discipline that is designed primarily to restrict the child's freedom, to reduce his power in the environment, or to increase his feelings of security.

Such an analysis requires not only the report of the parent as to whether or not a given method of punishment is used, but also a measure of the frequency of each type of punishment and of the areas of behavior in which each is used. A complete analysis, such as this, is therefore not possible from the data available in the present study.

SUMMARY

Further insight into the discipline culture of the homes studied is gained from the foregoing analysis. The analysis of the types of punishments used by parents who are relatively




FIGURE 3.—KINDS OF PUNISHMENT REPORTED BY PARENTS

sophisticated in child psychology points to a direction which research in parent-child relations should follow, and to a much needed emphasis in parent education: Discipline given by these parents (and undoubtedly by many parents) is predominantly confining and restrictive, and undermines the child's power. The effects of this kind of control as compared with discipline realistically aimed to increase the child's security and self-control urgently need to be studied. There is only indirect evidence in the literature on this question. Studies of positive versus negative commands in directing children and of conflicting commands give some evidence. Meyers (1944) reported significant decreases in maturity level and constructiveness of behavior after conflicting commands, increased inhibited and

stiff behavior after strong restraining commands, and increased nervous behavior after negative commands. Behavior variables in the children related to a restrictive home atmosphere are discussed in the present report (Chapter VII).

It is interesting to note the extent to which mothers and fathers behave similarly in the discipline of the child. This is true not only for mothers and fathers as a group but also for parents within the same family. The discipline roles of the fathers and mothers appear to be more similar than they were a generation ago, a similarity brought about, perhaps, by the fathers' assuming a more realistic and responsible role in parent-child relations. The extent to which this is true for other levels of the population is unknown. Although mothers and fathers report similar behavior toward the child, there are nevertheless contrasts in their roles as perceived by the child (Chapter VI).

VI. ANALYSIS OF THE CHILDREN'S INTERVIEW DATA

The preschool-age child has seldom been used as a reporter of conditions in his own life or in the lives of others. A systematic study of his ideas about himself and others by interview procedures has not been tried. The limits of his language and of his experience have been assumed to be too great barriers to his success as a reliable reporter.

In this research the child was asked to report verbally his reactions to several variables in his personal life. The success of the technique employed may be seen in the clarity and coherence of the individual reports of the children and, in other instances, in the degree of correspondence between reports of the child and reports of the parents on the same issues.

In composing and administering the oral questionnaire care was taken to use language and situations which were familiar to the children. The few instances in which a lack of understanding of the question was evident or suspected have been carefully noted. Interviews with the children gave an intimate account of their family relations as well as data on the ideology of these preschool children.

CHILDREN'S STANDARDS OF "GOOD" AND "BAD" BEHAVIOR

The child's pattern of values is extremely important, not only from the point of view of what these values are, but of how and from whom they are acquired, how permanent or rigid they are likely to be, their relative strengths, and their influence on behavior. The nature of social values, their growth, and the possibility of their change are crucial questions for understanding individual and cultural differences and for effecting individual and cultural changes.* Some of these questions have been studied in this investigation.

The child's standards of good and bad behavior are for him of paramount importance, for if he is to avoid conflict with the persons who exercise control over his behavior or if he is to gain their approval, *his* standards must, at least on the behavioral level, coincide with *their* standards. Young children

* For studies of children's ideologies see Bavelas (1942), Kalhorn (1944), Piaget (1932), and Wright (1942).

are continually admonished to be good or not to be naughty. A "good" boy or girl or a "naughty" boy or girl may mean various things to parents, but few parents have stopped to wonder what kind of behavior constitutes goodness or naughtiness in the mind of the child.

These questions were asked of the preschool children: "Tell me, what is a good girl [boy]? Tell me, what is a bad [naughty] girl [boy]?" (Interview items 4 and 5.) The questions were not directed toward the child himself but toward a hypothetical good child and bad or naughty child. This form of question has the advantage of avoiding the resistance and refusals encountered in asking the child directly about his own good or bad behavior, and it has the child answer not exclusively for himself but for the group—boys or girls—of which he feels himself a part.*

Each child was urged to continue until four responses had been given, presumably the most outstanding of his ideas about good and bad behavior. By urging him to give several responses, the influence of an immediately preceding situation in the school or home was minimized. Although the great majority of responses were given in very specific terms, they were easily classified into the categories listed in Tables 5 and 6. The agreement between two judges in categorizing the specific items was 94 per cent and 96 per cent for the good and bad behavior items respectively.

The frequencies with which children report various types of behavior are given in Tables 5 and 6. Goodness and badness at these ages have a relatively low content of moral ideas. The most moral of the categories are "does nice, kind things" and "says bad words, is cross, isn't nice." The children's values are best described as utilitarian and practical in nature. The child is good or bad as he fits into the adult routine, as he avoids adult displeasure, as he takes care of himself.

There are some differences between boys' and girls' responses. Girls are more aware of obedience to mother than boys; boys are more concerned about acts of violence, such as spitting, kicking, scratching; boys more often find helping mother a symptom of good behavior; girls more frequently report taking care of themselves either in routine or in play as a symptom

* A similar method for the study of group ideologies is reported by Bavelas (1942).

TABLE 5.—CHILDREN'S STANDARDS OF GOOD BEHAVIOR

Good Behavior	Percentage of Responses		
	Girls	Boys	Both
Helps mother (specific items such as dusts, washes, cleans, and performs other household tasks).....	20	40	29
Takes care of own routine (i.e., dresses self, goes to toilet, picks up toys, cleans up his mess, etc.).....	13	6	10
Plays (i.e., plays gently with dolls, colors, etc.).....	28	6	18
Does nice, kind things (i.e., does good things, does things for people, etc.)	13	30	21
Obeys mother (i.e., does what mother says, etc.).....	8	6	7
Doesn't destroy or break things (i.e., doesn't break records, etc.)	3	3	3
Stays out of mother's way (i.e., doesn't bother mother, etc.)	3	6	4
Miscellaneous and doesn't know.....	12	3	8

TABLE 6.—CHILDREN'S STANDARDS OF BAD BEHAVIOR

Bad Behavior	Percentage of Responses		
	Girls	Boys	Both
Doesn't do what mother asks.....	28	7	18
Doesn't do what other people tell him.....	0	14	6.5
Does overt acts of violence (i.e., spits, scratches, snatches, hits, breaks windows, throws mud, etc.)..	47	55	51
Cries, says bad words, is cross, isn't nice.....	12.5	17	15
Makes mother sad.....	0	7	3
Miscellaneous and doesn't know.....	12.5	0	6.5

of good behavior; being kind is suggested more often by boys than by girls.

In addition to the content of the child's standards, something about the sources or influences determining them can be inferred from these data. In none of the children's responses is mention made of a deity or similar authority behind the behavior value. The authority linked most frequently with judgments of good and bad is the mother. Good or bad depends largely upon the mother's standards and her responses to the child. In these data the father is strikingly absent as an authority behind the goodness and badness of activities.

Since these data point to the home as the chief source of the young child's behavior standards, the nature of his home and his parents from the child's point of view merits investigation.

CHILDREN'S PERCEPTIONS OF HOME AUTHORITY AND DISCIPLINE RELATIONS

The fact that the interactions of mother and father and of parent and child are keenly observed and evaluated by the

preschool-age child is demonstrated in the responses of these children to interview questions concerning discipline and authority in the home. The specific aspects on which the children's responses were obtained are analyzed below.

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' ROLES IN DISCIPLINE AND AUTHORITY

A comparison of the roles of mothers and fathers in discipline was made by asking the child: "When you are naughty, what happens? Who punishes you?" (Interview item 9.) In about half the cases the punishment is relegated entirely to one parent, the mother more than twice as frequently as the father (*CR* 2.76). These results substantiate the findings reported in the previous discussion, in which the mother was the authority most frequently associated with the goodness or badness of the behavior. There are no differences here between responses of boys and girls.

Mothers' and fathers' roles in discipline were also compared by the following questions: "Does your mother make you mind?" "Does your father make you mind?" (Interview items 6 and 7.) Seventy-four per cent of the children reported "yes" for mothers; 68 per cent reported "yes" and 5 per cent reported "sometimes" for fathers. That is, in about three fourths of the cases the child sees the authority of the parent as a restrictive influence in his life. About a fourth of the children do not regard the power as sufficiently strong to require obedience. The differences between mothers and fathers in this respect are not significant. When parental authority with girls was compared with parental authority with boys, there was a statistically insignificant difference (*CR* 1.43) in the direction of greater obedience demanded from boys than from girls.

Although ostensibly these questions involve a comparison of the mother's and the father's authority, differences are not likely to be revealed by the questions unless a very marked contrast in the parents is felt by the child. The form of the question makes it easiest for the child to give an all or none answer, and without further elaboration this precludes comparison of the relative weight of the mother's and the father's authority.

Although mothers are more often than fathers the agents of punishment, the fathers, according to the children, deal out punishments more severely (*CR* 4.35, fathers harder than moth-

ers; interview item 12, "Who punishes you harder, your mother or your father?").

The children were asked to tell the kind of punishments received from the father and from the mother. (Interview items 10 and 11.) Spankings and isolation predominate as methods of both parents. Seventy-four per cent of the children reported spanking and 33 per cent reported isolation. Spanking is reported more frequently by girls than by boys from both fathers and mothers, though the differences are not statistically significant (CR 's 2.05 and 1.40 for mothers and fathers respectively in the more frequent use of spanking with girls than boys). Isolation is reported more frequently by boys than girls from both parents, though again the differences are not statistically significant (CR 's 1.52 and 1.48 for mothers and fathers respectively in the more frequent use of isolation with boys than girls).

This picture of disciplinary methods as seen by the child shows little variation or ingenuity on the part of parents. It is possible that subtler methods of coercion or guidance are not recognized by the child as disciplinary in character. Even admitting the possibility of the latter fact, however, the parents' discipline techniques do not present a very understanding or respectful attitude toward the child. A few illustrative comments by the children will demonstrate what is meant and will show also the children's complete understanding of the questions asked them. The children were asked: "When you are naughty, what does your mother do? What does your father do?" (Interview items 10 and 11.) The answers were: "He spanks me so hard I can hardly stand it." "She yells at me and comes and runs at me; she doesn't spank me. She puts me in my room for a little while." "He hits me in the face." "She hits me with a spoon." "He hits me with a stick." "He hits me with a spatula."

This failure of parents to respect the child's personality and to treat him tactfully warrants attention. The child's first patterns for handling social situations are his parents' actions. If the parents show little tact or respect in dealing with the child, it can hardly be hoped that the child will do otherwise in social relations. The parental discipline behavior in this study occurs in a culturally elite population. The parental symptom noted

here would without doubt be greatly magnified in a more representative population.

CHILDREN'S REACTIONS TO PARENTAL DISCIPLINE

The child's reaction to parental discipline is one means of evaluating the effectiveness of the discipline and the meaning which the parents' actions have for the child. The children were asked: "How do children feel after their mother or father punishes them?" (Interview item 13.) It is assumed that effective discipline prevents the recurrence of bad conduct and/or encourages the performance of sanctioned behavior. If we rely upon the children's evaluations of the punishments received from their parents, only a very small percentage of the punishments received fulfill these functions of effective discipline (Table 7). For the preschool children from this sample of privileged homes, feelings of unhappiness and memories of physical pain from punishments leave a far deeper impression than resolutions to avoid disapproved behavior or to change to better behavior. There are no differences in boys' and girls' responses to this question.

TABLE 7.—CHILDREN'S REPORTED FEELINGS AS A RESULT OF PARENTAL PUNISHMENTS

Response to Punishment	Percentage of Cases
Feelings of penitence or resolutions for better behavior.....	14
Feelings of sadness, unhappiness, pain.....	63
Feeling that punishment was unjustified.....	7
Didn't feel better or worse.....	5
Don't know how they feel.....	11

Why so large a proportion of punishment should mean pain and unhappiness may be due either to the fact that the parent's motive is frequently one of giving vent to his own anger or of getting even with the child, or to the fact that the parent has tried to use discipline as a guidance measure but has failed to get this meaning across to the child.

A partial answer is to be found in the responses to the following questions. When asked if their parents showed anger when disciplining them (interview items 15 and 17), 51 per cent of the children reported that their fathers showed anger and 58 per cent reported that their mothers showed anger. Again,

there were no differences in the reports made by boys and by girls.

Questioned concerning the extent to which parents attempt to explain to the child the reasons for the punishments they give (interview items 18 and 19), the children reported that 38 per cent of the mothers and 49 per cent of the fathers did not give them explanations.

When asked, "Do some mothers and fathers sometimes punish their children when the children don't need to be punished? Do yours?" (interview item 14), 17 per cent of the children felt that the punishments were sometimes given when the child did not need them; 83 per cent felt that their punishments were justified.

These reactions of the children would indicate, as suggested earlier, the parents' unmindfulness of the significance or meaning of their actions for the young child.

If these questions are pursued farther, it is soon evident that the child as early as preschool age has certain standards of the approved forms of parent-child relations. One indication of this is his opinions about obedience. Regardless of how these children feel about the punishments received from their parents, almost without exception (95 per cent) they answered in the affirmative when asked, "Should children always do what their mother and father tell them? Why?" (Interview item 17.)

This social value thus appears to be one about which there is little conflict; as approved conduct it is completely accepted. Specific mention of obedience was infrequent in the children's descriptions of good behavior, but it seems to be frequently implied in these responses (see Table 5). The reasons given for obedience to mother and father are less uniform (Table 8).

TABLE 8.—CHILDREN'S REASONS FOR OBEDIENCE TO PARENTS

Reason	Percentage of Cases
To be nice or do the right thing.....	33
Parents want the child to obey.....	14
Parents make the child obey.....	10
To avoid punishment.....	19
Children have to be told.....	5
So the child won't do it again.....	5
Mother can't stand it and God will take her to heaven.....	2
"I'd like to know why".....	2
Don't know	10

General principles of right or wrong are not wholly lacking; 47 per cent of the responses include the idea of obedience because it is the "right" thing to do or because it is the wish of the parents. The next most frequent reason for obedience is a utilitarian one: either the child "has to," is made to obey, or he does it to escape harm of one kind or another (29 per cent).

In view of the children's frequent reports of physical punishments from their parents and the parents' display of anger, one might expect a great number of them to feel fear of their parents. Table 9 shows the responses given when they were asked if they feared either parent. (Interview items 20, 21.) Boys show fear of parents more often than do girls, though the differences are statistically insignificant.

TABLE 9.—PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN REPORTING FEAR OF PARENTS

	Of Fathers			Of Mothers		
	Boys	Girls	Both	Boys	Girls	Both
Fear	26	14	20	32	12.5	21
No fear	74	86	80	66	87.5	79

Several responses from the children to the question about fear of parents illustrate well their full appreciation of the questions asked. *Bjarne*: "I'm not afraid of my daddy, 'cause we're all one family." *Maria*: "I'm not afraid because I love my daddy." *Konstantin*: "I'm kinda afraid of my mother, only when she spansks me."

ASPECTS OF PARENTAL SUPERVISION

The following items of the interview, dealing more with the supervisory than with the punishment aspects of authority and discipline, were not particularly effective in revealing parental differences: "Do your mother and father help you a lot?" "Do you wish that they would help you more?" "Do you wish that they did not help you so much?" (Interview items 22, 23, 24.) Eighty-six per cent of the boys and 75 per cent of the girls replied that their parents helped them "a lot." When asked if they wanted more or less help than they now receive, the children showed considerable confusion, enough so that group responses must be regarded as wholly unreliable.

Questions were asked about several specific aspects of the play life of the child which suggested themselves as possible

friction points between parent and child. One question concerned the choice of playmates: "Do your mother and father let you play with anybody you want to play with?" (Interview item 25.)

Either children of this age are unaware of parental choices of their playmates, or parents are not restrictive about the choice of playmates, or (what seems most probable for these children) there are too few children in the neighborhood to allow a great deal of selection. Typical responses were: *Andrew*: "There isn't much of any little boys to play with. Just two girls and two boys." *Lillian*: "There isn't much children there." Perhaps the question of choice of playmates becomes more important to parents as the child grows older.

Though these parents do not appear to be overly selective in their child's choice of playmates, they do not like the idea of their child's bringing his playmate into their house to play. To the question, "Does your mother like it when you bring children into the house to play?" (interview item 27), 47 per cent of the boys and 37.5 per cent of the girls replied that their mothers did not like them to bring playmates into the house to play.

Along the same line is the question: "Does your mother tell you all the time to keep your feet off the chairs, not to scratch the furniture, not to get it dirty?" (Interview item 26.) Probably not significant in itself, though indicative of the kind of behavior that is interfering or annoying to adults, is the young child's disregard for the furniture and other physical surroundings in the home. Scratched walls, scratched table tops, and so forth, were mentioned frequently in the children's descriptions of naughty boys and girls. Again in item 26 the prevalence of such behavior is evident. Sixty-eight per cent of the boys and 70 per cent of the girls report that their mothers are frequently telling them to exercise care with house and furniture.

PARENT-CHILD RAPPORT AND PREFERENCES

Studies of the parental preferences of children have reported a preference for mothers, which increases with the age of the children studied. Meltzer (1941) has suggested that this preference is probably related to the greater amount of contact between mother and child than between father and child, to a greater distance between father and child than between mother

and child. It seemed likely that origins of these preferences might be found in the parent-child relations of the preschool years—relations of both a pleasant and an unpleasant nature. Hence the parental preferences of these children were studied with regard to the nature of the child's relationships with the preferred and the nonpreferred parent.

The children's feelings toward mothers and fathers in the areas of punishment have already been given. In these respects parents rate about evenly in the opinions of their young children. Though mothers punish more often than fathers, fathers punish harder, and both parents are feared about equally. One may then ask in what other aspects of authority and discipline may parental preferences have their origins? For an answer we turn to questions of parent-child rapport: "If you have a secret do you like to tell it to your mother?" (Same for father. Interview items 28, 29.) "Do you ask your mother a lot of questions? Does she answer them?" (Same for father. Interview items 30, 31.) "Whom do you like most of all? Whom don't you like very much?" (Interview items 32, 33.) "Whom do mothers like most of all? Does your mother?" (Same for father. Interview items 34, 35.) "What do you and your father do together that is fun?" (Same for mother. Interview items 36, 37.)

Are children closer to the mother or the father at this age? If confidences given each parent are compared and if questions asked and answered by each parent are compared and interpreted as indicative of distance between parent and child, no difference is shown between mother-child and father-child rapport. Children confided in 72 per cent of the mothers and 68 per cent of the fathers—an insignificant difference between mothers and fathers. Girls tend to confide in their parents more than do boys, though again the critical ratios are not sufficiently high to be significant (*CR* 1.15 favoring girls in confiding in mothers; *CR* 1.43 favoring girls in confiding in fathers).

According to the children's reports, they ask their mothers questions as frequently as they ask their fathers. Sixty-seven per cent report asking their mothers many questions; 70 per cent of these mothers answer the questions. Seventy per cent report asking their fathers many questions; 83 per cent of these fathers answer the questions. (There is an insignificant difference in answering children's questions in favor of the fathers, *CR* 1.39.)

Children of this age recognize times in their relations with their parents in which questions are definitely discouraged by the parents. *Haakon*: "Sometimes when I talk he doesn't talk to me. He's busy." *Anne*: "He don't like to be bothered when he is sleeping." In none of these areas of rapport is a definite mother or father preference manifested by the group.

Because of objections to asking the children outright which parent they preferred, it was necessary to get at the preference in a roundabout way by asking: "Whom do you like most of all?" and "Whom don't you like very much?" The mother was reported as the best liked by 21 per cent of the boys and by 4 per cent of the girls (*CR* 1.68 between boys and girls). The father was reported as best liked by 5 per cent of the boys and 21 per cent of the girls (*CR* 1.65 between boys and girls). Twenty-six per cent of the boys and 35 per cent of the girls name both parents as best liked. Forty-two per cent of the boys and 38 per cent of the girls named another adult or a child as best liked. The rest of the children responded "Nobody" or refused to answer.

For the person disliked most, 11 per cent of the boys and none of the girls named the father; 6 per cent of the boys and none of the girls named both parents.

The percentage differences described above, between boys' and girls' responses to mothers and fathers, suggest some slight evidence in favor of an oedipus relationship. Although the differences are small and unreliable in character, they take the expected direction.

In comparison with these outgoing affectional feelings of children toward their parents there are the ideas which children have concerning the incoming affectional feelings of parents toward them. These children were asked whom they thought their parents liked most. From the answers there is no evidence that children feel more certain of the affections of one parent than of the other. Children reported themselves as first in the affections of the mother in 53 per cent of the cases; of the father in 47 per cent of the cases. Most of the children seemed to have little doubt in their minds as to the affectional attachments of their parents. Their reports are given in Table 10.

One further question on comparative relations between child and father and child and mother concerned the fun had with each. The majority of children reported some kind of fun

TABLE 10.—CHILDREN'S REPORTS OF THEIR PARENTS' AFFECTIONS*

Parents Like Best	Percentage	
	Mothers	Fathers
Their children (subject plus siblings).....	53	47
Spouse	18	25
Themselves	2	5
Another child in the family.....	7	5
Their friends	14	10
College	0	3
Don't know	6	5

* There were no sex differences in the reports.

TABLE 11.—CHILDREN'S REPORTS OF FUN WITH THEIR PARENTS

Kind of Fun	With Fathers (Per Cent)	With Mothers (Per Cent)
Playing games	67	52
Doing housework	2	21
Reading	2	2.25
Going places	4.5	2.25
Turning somersaults, etc.	9	2.25
Giving child things	4.5	2.25
Parent does not play with child.....	11	18

with both parents. Eleven per cent of the children reported having no fun with their fathers; 18 per cent reported having no fun with their mothers. The kind of fun differs somewhat with mothers and fathers, but playing games is the chief source of fun. Helping mother with the household tasks is enjoyed by both boys and girls. (See Table 11.)

Some of the children reporting no fun with their parent had the following to say: *Haakon*: "I have fun. My mother never has fun. She has to do so many things. The maid is gone." *Thekla*: "She has to work; she doesn't have time to play. She'd like to." *Leslie*: "Nothing. She just knits."

The trends in answers to this group of questions do not offer any substantial clues to the origins of parental preferences. Perhaps at these ages there are no preferences which appear as group differences. This conclusion seems justified since it is substantiated in the answers to each of the questionnaire items discussed above. These data do not confirm the findings of Meltzer (1941) and Simpson (1935), who report a general preference for mothers in the groups of children they studied. The contradiction in findings may be explained partly as due to age differences since the subjects of Meltzer's and Simpson's investigations

were, for the most part, older than the preschool group interviewed here. Factors which differentiate father-child and mother-child relations and contribute to a more favored position of the mother may not begin to function until children are somewhat older than the group studied here.

When specific kinds of influence on parental preference are analyzed, there is disagreement between this study and the one reported by Simpson. Simpson found that, with children 5 to 9 years old, showing affection toward the child, taking care of his physical wants, playing with him, and punishing him least were influential in determining preference. These same factors showed no relation to parental preference among preschool children in this investigation.

When families were analyzed separately to determine whether discipline factors reported as characteristic of the father and mother in that family were related to the child's preference, no relationship was found. The child reporting his father as being a severe disciplinarian or as preferring another sibling or as never playing with him may also report his father as the preferred parent. Similarly, the parent who punishes least, who answers the child's questions most faithfully, who plays the most with the child may likewise be an unfavored parent. The variables determining parental preference are apparently imbedded in other, subtler aspects of parent and child personality than have been uncovered in these discipline relations.

If differential affectional relations between child and father and child and mother are nonexistent for the group, it is logical to question further: Do these children likewise respond similarly to mothers and to fathers in discipline situations? Apparently they do not. These children are significantly more obedient to father than to mother. (Interview items 40, 41.) Sixty-five per cent and 35 per cent of the responses indicated obedience to father and mother respectively (*CR* 4.00). If these items are related to items 9 and 12 on the interview, where fathers are reported as punishing less frequently and more severely than mothers, the responses might be construed to mean that effective discipline is a function of the infrequency and comparative severity of the discipline.

PUNISHMENT ADVOCATED BY CHILDREN

Interview item 42 was asked in order to discover what chil-

dren of this age level had acquired as their concept of the proper kinds of punishment to be given children who are naughty. That this concept is acquired in the home is verified by comparing the responses to 10 and 11 ("What *does* your mother do when you are naughty? What *does* your father do?") with responses to 42 ("What *should* mothers and fathers do when their children are naughty?"). These children recommend as suitable punishments those which they themselves are given. (See Table 12.)

TABLE 12.—FORMS OF PARENTAL PUNISHMENT RECOMMENDED BY CHILDREN

Form of Punishment Recommended	Percentage Recommending It
Spanking	83
Isolation	11
Scolding and talking cross.....	2
Playing	2
Don't know	2

PARENTAL CONSISTENCY AND AGREEMENT IN DISCIPLINE

Some parents frequently threaten punishment but never carry out the threat. This variable was investigated in the question: "When your mother says she is going to punish you, does she always do it?" (Same for father. Interview items 43 and 44.) Mothers show a slight but statistically insignificant tendency to carry out threatened punishments more faithfully than do fathers. (Forty-five per cent of the fathers and 60.5 per cent of the mothers carry them out; *CR* 1.43.) One may ask, Do parents carry out threats more frequently with boys than girls or vice versa? Mothers here show a greater likelihood of carrying out threatened punishments with girls than with boys (71 per cent and 47 per cent respectively, *CR* 1.63). Fathers do not differ in this respect in their treatment of girls and boys (48 per cent and 44 per cent respectively).

Interview items 38 and 39 attempt to find out how much parents reinforce each other or contradict each other in the commands or requests made to the child. "If you wanted an ice-cream cone very much and your father said no, what would your mother say if you asked her?" (38.) "If you wanted to go out to play and your mother said no, what would your father say if you asked him?" (39.) Thirty-nine per cent of the children's answers indicated parental agreement and 61 per cent

indicated parental disagreement, a difference in percentages that approaches statistical significance (*CR* 2.84).

Questions 45 and 64 were used to get at the consistency of discipline; they are not, however, good indicators. "Can you tell ahead of time that your mother will punish you when she finds out what you were doing?" (Same for father. Interview items 45, 46.) The difficulty of putting "consistency" into verbal terms that would be understood by the child was not successfully overcome. As reported in these statements, 57 per cent of the mothers and 49 per cent of the fathers are predictable as to what they will punish the child for.

CHILDREN'S METHODS OF CONTROLLING PARENTS

The methods by which parents gain their ends with the child have been discussed. There are times and ways in which children succeed in gaining their ends with the parent. This is accomplished by a variety of means. By putting the most frequently used of these techniques into descriptions of situations common to most young children, it was believed possible to learn which methods the child himself used, and which were effective with the parents. (Interview items 47, 48.) The results are given in Table 13.

TABLE 13.—PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN USING VARIOUS METHODS OF CONTROLLING PARENTS

Method Used and the Result	With Mother		With Father	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
Pays no attention to parent's request				
Success	26	25	39	29
Failure	74	75	61	71
Cries, has tantrums				
Success	21	26	17	14
Failure	79	74	83	86
Refuses parent's requests				
Success	50	26	41	19
Failure	50	74	59	81
Whines, begs, etc.				
Success	47	39	53	33
Failure	53	61	47	67

Verbal appeals by the child, especially by the boys, appear to be the most successful technique by which the child can gain his ends with his parents. Though the sex differences are again insignificant, trends consistent for each of the four categories of behavior show the fathers to be more exacting (i.e., more fre-

quently to require obedience of the child no matter what his attempts to control the parent) for the girls' behavior than for the boys'. The same trend is apparent, though less pronounced, for the mothers. An alternative interpretation would be that boys are more successful than girls in controlling parents.

CHILDREN'S DISLIKES IN PARENTAL BEHAVIOR

Parents are given ample opportunities to express criticisms of their children, and many data have been obtained on the likes and dislikes of parents concerning child behavior. Few persons have bothered to find out what the preschool child dislikes in parent behavior. The criticisms made by the children of their parents are given in Table 14. (Interview items 50, 51.)

TABLE 14.—TYPES OF PARENTAL BEHAVIOR DISLIKED BY CHILDREN

Type of Parental Behavior	Disliked in Mother (Per Cent)	Disliked in Father (Per Cent)
Punishing and interfering with play.....	46	50
Doing housework	10	0
Going to work	0	11
Running (going) away	5	5
Staying in bed	10	3
Miscellaneous	5	5
None	24	26

TABLE 15.—CHILDREN'S PERCEPTIONS OF THE KIND OF CHANGE IN THEIR BEHAVIOR DESIRED BY THE PARENT

Nature of Change in Child Desired by Parent	Responses about Mother		Responses about Father	
	Girls (N=7)	Boys (N=6)	Girls (N=10)	Boys (N=8)
Doesn't know	3	3	3	2
Be different	1	1	0	0
Be nicer or be good.....	1	2	2	5
Have different hair or different hair- cut	1	0	4	0
Be a boy	1	0	0	0
Play differently	0	0	1	0
Be like father	0	0	0	1

There appears to be a great similarity in the criticisms made by children of their fathers and mothers. About half the criticisms center around discipline and authority exercised by the parent. There are some personality criticisms, such as "She teases me," "He talks cross," but for the most part personality

elements in the parents are unrecognized or, more probably, un verbalized by the child at this age.

Along with an interest in the child's critical attitude toward his parents goes an interest in the child's awareness of a critical or negative attitude on the part of the parent toward him. In response to the questions "Does your mother like you just the way you are, or would she like you to be different? How would she like you to be?" (same for father; interview items 52, 53), 70 per cent of the girls and 68 per cent of the boys felt that their mothers were satisfied with them; 52 per cent of the girls and 56 per cent of the boys felt that their fathers were satisfied with them. Fathers were judged to be less satisfied with their children than mothers, but the difference is statistically insignificant (*CR* 1.48).

When parental dissatisfactions were perceived by the child, he was asked to indicate the kind of changes in his behavior which the parent seemed to desire. Most of these responses were general, or the child was unable to tell how the parent would like him to improve (Table 15). The numbers are too small to allow any generalizations, but it is interesting to note the frequency with which little girls mention factors of physical appearance.

CHILDREN'S DESCRIPTIONS OF "MOTHER" AND "FATHER"

Again we approach parent-child relationships from the child's point of view and attempt, through the child's responses, to gain insight into the role which parents play for the young child. Analysis of the components of the children's descriptions of "mother" and "father" and analysis of the relative weight of various parent functions and parent-child contacts in these descriptions might give indications of the kinds of changes in parent-child relations concomitant with age changes, of differential parent-child relations in various cultural groups, of marked parental deviation from the norm of parent-child relations, and of the effects of a given variable upon parent-child relations.

Data on the children's descriptions of mothers and fathers were analyzed by grouping the responses into categories of activities (without mention of interaction with another person), person-to-person relations, and personality descriptions and evaluations. The frequencies with which various descriptions are given by the children are reported in Table 16 and in Figure 4.

TABLE 16.—CHILDREN'S DESCRIPTIONS OF MOTHERS AND FATHERS

Description Given by Child (284 Responses)	Percentage of Responses		CR
	About Mother	About Father	
Activities			
Housework	54.0	15.0	7.7
Goes to work	0	23.0	6.3
Works around (mechanical type)	0	6.0	
Goes to school, studies, writes	3.3	4.0	
Self-recreation or relaxation	4.0	24.0	4.4
Personality characteristics			
Man-woman	11.0	6.0	
Big and strong7	2.0	
Interpersonal relations			
Supervision and care of child	18.3	2.0	5.0
Plays with child	2.0	4.0	
Punishes child	4.0	6.0	
Affection given to child	2.0	1.0	
Mother-father interaction7	4.0	
Miscellaneous	0	3.0	

The preschool-age child's ideas about mothers and fathers are based mainly on the operations most observable and most frequently characteristic of the parent's activities. Parents are seen by preschool children as persons whose primary functions are related to child rearing and to work functions both in and outside the home. Parents are rarely regarded as companions of each other. The majority of responses reflect a matter-of-fact and nonemotional attitude toward both mothers and fathers.

There is little difference in girls' and boys' descriptions of their parents. The greatest sex differences are found in the subcategories of activities of the father: Goes to work is a response given more frequently by boys than girls (*CR* 2.05). Self-recreation or relaxation is a response given more frequently by girls than boys (*CR* 1.27). Works around (hammers, saws, and so forth) is a response given more frequently by boys than girls (*CR* 1.90). This may be interpreted as an indication of a similar pattern of relationships between girls and their parents and boys and their parents.

Responses of person-to-person interaction were analyzed in terms of the kind of interaction denoted by the child's response—whether it was pleasant or unpleasant, and toward whom it was directed. There was not a single response indicating an affection relation between the parents. Even neutral parental interaction constitutes a very small percentage of the responses. Mothers are described as directing activity of any




FIGURE 4.—CHILDREN'S DESCRIPTIONS OF MOTHERS AND FATHERS

The portions of the graph represent the frequencies with which various descriptions are given by the children in response to the questions: "What is a mother? What is a father?"

Key: W=work; R=self, recreation, relaxation; Pe=personality characteristics; MF=mother-father interactions; A=affection given child; PI=plays with child; S=supervises child; P=punishes child; M=miscellaneous.

kind toward the father in .7 per cent of the responses; fathers are described as directing activity of any kind toward the mother in 4 per cent of the responses.

Responses denoting actions of the mother (pleasant and unpleasant) directed toward the child were given in 23 per cent of the responses. Responses denoting actions of the father directed toward the child were given in 13 per cent of the responses (*CR* 2.46 in favor of more child-directed actions from mothers than fathers).

Of all the responses about the mother, 4 per cent could be classified as definitely pleasant in feeling and 4 per cent as definitely unpleasant in feeling. Of responses about the father, 5 per cent could be classified as definitely pleasant, and 6 per cent as definitely unpleasant.

Comparison of these findings with those reported by Meltzer (1935), in which the techniques used were similar, allows some analysis of age differences. Meltzer's subjects were 8 to 16 years of age. Differences evident in the two sets of results are a greater emphasis by the children in his study on the personality char-

acteristics of the parents; a greater emphasis by the older children on the pleasantness or unpleasantness of parent-child relations; and a greater differentiation of the concepts by the older children.

SUMMARY

The character of parent-child interactions with regard to the authority and discipline aspects of these interactions are reported with considerable clarity by the preschool-age child. The validity of the children's responses cannot be stated statistically. It rests upon the child's understanding of the questions and his cooperation in answering them. In all but a few instances these conditions were met.

The major findings of the children's reports are concerned with the child's values in behavior, with his perception of the governing authority of his parents and his reactions to it, and with his perception of the parents' roles and behavior.

For preschool-age children the character of behavior ("good" or "bad") is determined primarily by the approval or disapproval which it brings from the parent. There is no real internalization of behavior values in terms of self-approval or disapproval. The mother is much more important than the father in determining the child's behavior values.

When the discipline and authority behavior of mother and father are compared, mothers are more frequently administrators of punishments, while fathers are more severe in their punishments and more frequently obeyed. There is very little difference in father-child and mother-child rapport as measured by fears, confidences, preferences, fun together, or affectional relations; the parent preference of the child does not appear to be related to any single one of these factors.

Parents, as described by the children, are fairly stereotyped in the kinds of disciplinary techniques they employ. They fail in many instances to respect the child's personality and to administer the kind of discipline which for the child means an effective deterrent from bad behavior and an encouragement for good behavior. The child conceives of the parents as his rightful authorities, professes willing obedience to them, and in general recommends the kinds of punishments which they use.

The child's free associations about mothers and fathers are heavily weighted with descriptions of the work and activities of

the parents and are strikingly low in elements of parental companionship, affectional relationships, and personality evaluations.

Children of preschool age in interview situations respond freely concerning their reactions to parent-child variables. This source of data is enlightening in a study of parent-child relations and is a valuable supplement to reports on the home given from the point of view of the parent and adult.

VII. RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN HOME ATMOSPHERE AND CHILD BEHAVIOR

The futility of using single, isolated items of parent behavior and relating them to child behavior has been demonstrated in previous investigations of this problem. In this study, therefore, several broader aspects of discipline and authority were studied: autocratic or democratic control of the child, amount and areas of restrictions on child or amount of freedom, severity or mildness of punishment, rapport between parent and child, the relative responsibility of the parents for the child's discipline, and sibling compatibility or incompatibility. Definitions of these variables and the scales for their measurement have already been discussed in Chapter V. That the scales represent non-overlapping variables is demonstrated by the intercorrelations among them. The coefficients were insignificant, $-.15$ to $+.08$.

On the basis of scores on these scales of home atmosphere, the children were divided into two groups: those scoring high and those scoring low on each of the atmosphere variables. The relationships between home atmosphere differences and the child's behavior were measured by comparing children of contrasting atmospheres (1) on teachers' ratings of their behavior in preschool, (2) in experimental situations of compliance, (3) on projective picture data (Chapter VIII), and (4) on projective doll play (Chapter IX). The results of comparisons 1 and 2 follow.

HOME ATMOSPHERE AND CHILD BEHAVIOR RATINGS IN PRESCHOOL

The preschool teachers rated each child on twenty behavior patterns. Each of the patterns was rated on a graphic scale, which is described in Chapter IV and presented in Appendix III. Quantitative scores were obtained by dividing the six-inch scale lines into half-inch intervals. Each item then yielded scores ranging from 1 to 12. The successive items on the scale were so arranged that the more desirable aspect of the behavior is sometimes on the right and sometimes on the left end of the rating line.

A measure of the reliability of the ratings was obtained by correlating the scores given by one teacher on each item for

every child with the scores given by the second teacher. The teachers chosen to do the ratings were two teachers in the kindergarten and two teachers in the nursery school. They knew the children about equally well and were the best qualified of the staff to make the behavior ratings. The reliability coefficients obtained are .48 ($SE \pm .04$) and .60 ($SE \pm .03$) on the nursery school and kindergarten groups respectively.

The t test* was used to determine the significance of the differences in behavior in preschool related to differences on each of the scales of home atmosphere (Table 17). The F test for determining differences in variability was applied where t 's were obtained which approached statistical significance. Unless otherwise reported, the F 's obtained indicated insignificant differences in the variabilities.

The average scores in Table 17 represent the scores on a scale of 1 to 12 of the teacher-rated behavior for the two groups

TABLE 17.—TEACHERS' RATINGS OF PRESCHOOL BEHAVIOR ON THE BASIS OF HOME ATMOSPHERE VARIABLES

Teacher-Rated Behavior Variable	Average Ratings of Children of Contrasting Home Atmospheres		t	Significance Level (Per Cent)
AUTOCRATIC-DEMOCRATIC				
Rivalrous to nonrivalrous.....	democ.	5.0	1.88	10-5
	autoc.	6.5		
Follower to leader.....	democ.	5.7	1.56	20-10
	autoc.	7.1		
Popular to unpopular.....	democ.	4.7	1.73	10-5
	autoc.	6.0		
Doesn't get along to gets along well with others	autoc.	5.5	2.09	5-2
	democ.	7.9		
Considerate to inconsiderate.....	democ.	4.2	2.24	5-2
	autoc.	6.0		
Emotionally unstable to emotionally stable	autoc.	5.7	1.66	10-5
	democ.	7.6		
Uninhibited to inhibited.....	autoc.	5.4	1.74	10-5
	democ.	6.8		
Sensitive to insensitive.....	democ.	4.2	1.86	10-5
	autoc.	5.5		
FREEDOM-GIVING-RESTRICTIVE DISCIPLINE				
Rivalrous to nonrivalrous.....	free	4.2	2.78	1
	restr.	6.2		
Popular to unpopular.....	free	4.4	2.31	5-2
	restr.	5.6		
Active, colorful to passive, colorless behavior	free	5.5	1.98	10-5
	restr.	6.9		

* The t test for small independent samples, Lindquist (1940), p. 57.

TABLE 17.—Continued

Teacher-Rated Behavior Variable	Average Ratings of Children of Contrasting Home Atmospheres		<i>t</i>	Signifi- cance Level (Per Cent)
MILD-SEVERE PUNISHMENT				
Talkative to quiet.....	mild	2.0 }	1.76	10-5
	severe	4.5 }		
Rivalrous to nonrivalrous.....	mild	4.7 }	3.43	1
	severe	7.2 }		
Affectionate to nonaffectionate.....	mild	4.0 }	1.88	10-5
	severe	5.3 }		
Popular to unpopular.....	mild	4.7 }	1.88	10-5
	severe	6.0 }		
Considerate to inconsiderate.....	mild	4.2 }	2.08	5-2
	severe	5.8 }		
Sensitive to insensitive.....	mild	4.0 }	2.75	1
	severe	5.9 }		
RAPPORT WITH MOTHER (GOOD-POOR)				
Low energy to high energy.....	poor	4.0 }	4.63	1
	good	7.7 }		
RAPPORT WITH FATHER (GOOD-POOR)				
Uninhibited to inhibited.....	poor	5.1 }	2.13	5-2
	good	7.0 }		
RELATIVE RESPONSIBILITY OF PARENTS FOR DISCIPLINE OF CHILD (EQUAL-MOSTLY MOTHER'S RESPONSIBILITY)				
Rivalrous to nonrivalrous.....	mother's		1.62	20-10
	resp.	5.1 }		
	equal	6.0 }		
Follower to leader.....	mother's		2.68	1
	resp.	5.7 }		
	equal	7.8 }		
Noncompliant to compliant.....	equal	5.9 }	1.52	20-10
	mother's	7.3 }		
	resp.			
SIBLING RELATIONS (HARMONIOUS-INHARMONIOUS)				
Talkative to quiet.....	inhar.	4.3 }	1.50	20-10
	har.	5.8 }		
Rivalrous to nonrivalrous.....	inhar.	5.2 }	1.95	10-5
	har.	6.6 }		
Low energy to high energy.....	har.	6.4 }	2.14	5-2
	inhar.	8.2 }		
Doesn't get along to gets along well with others	inhar.	5.7 }	2.38	5-2
	har.	8.3 }		
Noncompliant to compliant.....	inhar.	5.2 }	2.55	5-2
	har.	7.8 }		
Emotionally unstable to emotionally stable	inhar.	4.9 }	4.59	1
	har.	8.9 }		
"Ladylike" to "tomboy" behavior....	har.	4.1 }	2.99	1
	inhar.	7.0 }		
Active, colorful to passive, colorless behavior	inhar.	4.6 }	3.32	1
	har.	7.8 }		

of children divided on the basis of high and low scores on the home variables. The teacher-rated behavior variables are stated with the low-scoring end of the scale given first. Thus, rivalrous to nonrivalrous means that a score of 1 indicates extreme rivalry; a score of 12 indicates extreme nonrivalry. An average score of 5.0 is made by the children in the group of democratic home discipline. An average score of 6.5 is made by the children in the group of autocratic home discipline. The table entry is interpreted thus: The children from relatively democratic homes are rated somewhat more rivalrous than the children from the relatively autocratic homes.

DEMOCRATIC-AUTOCRATIC HOME ATMOSPHERE

Children whose homes are characterized by a relatively autocratic discipline atmosphere were rated by preschool teachers as more unpopular with other children, more frequently fighting and quarreling with the other children, more inconsiderate of others, more emotionally unstable, more uninhibited and daring, less rivalrous, and more insensitive to praise or blame than children from the more democratic atmospheres. These children were also rated somewhat higher, though not statistically significantly so, in a dominative type of leadership than children with more democratic home atmospheres. These differences are small; hence interpretations can be only tentative.

This constellation of behavior characteristics associated with the democratic-autocratic variable, which appears somewhat contradictory and incongruent, may be more consistent than is at first evident. The following interpretation is proposed: The behavior and attitudes of the parent who creates an autocratic discipline atmosphere in the home have behind them an ideology of power in which the parent is in complete control of the action of the child; in which a respect for the child's rights and wishes is lacking; in which the child's needs are entirely subordinated to the power of the parent.

From these home surroundings, the child enters a preschool environment presumably much less autocratic in nature, an environment of contemporaries whose powers are not insurmountable (as in the case of the parent). The child, then, in his relations in the preschool assumes the role and behavior of his parent. He acts without consideration of others; he is insen-

sitive to their praise or blame, uninhibited and bold in meeting preschool situations. He does not show rivalry toward his contemporaries, but, rather, assumes or forces his own autocratic domination and mastery over the others, in this way rating somewhat higher on leadership (defined in the teachers' ratings as exerting his influence on others) than children from more democratic home atmospheres. (Whether this type of behavior can be termed leadership is doubtful. Data on leadership behavior among young children are meager. It is quite probable that leadership at this age is frequently only a temporary domination of others. A fascinating problem is raised in this connection—that of determining the developmental changes in leadership, that is, the development of nondominating democratic leadership.)

Unpopularity and not getting along well with other children follow as logical outcomes of the child's behavior. Instability of mood or poor emotional control is an expected outcome of the conflicting atmospheres and roles in home and school, his lack of rapport with the children, and the resultant insecurities and uncertainties of his situation.

Although it is not wholly justifiable to regard democratic as the opposite of autocratic control, yet, for the descriptions of home variables available here, democratic philosophy and practice constitute somewhat opposite characteristics from the autocratic view. Children from the more democratic home atmosphere have (automatically from the scoring) a constellation of behavior characteristics opposite to that of the autocratically controlled children. They are rated more popular, considerate, compliant, emotionally stable, sensitive to the opinions of others, and rivalrous, and less quarrelsome with other children. Their ratings on the leadership scale are slightly lower than those of the autocratically controlled children. They are not, however, rated as followers. Similarly, on the scale of uninhibited, daring behavior, the democratically controlled are rated as somewhat less reckless and uninhibited but are not at the opposite extreme of undue caution and inhibition. (Average rating scale values in Table 17 for children from home atmosphere dichotomies indicate where on the rating scales the two groups lie. The absolute as well as the relative positions on the rating scale must be considered in interpreting the data.)

FREEDOM-GIVING-RESTRICTIVE HOME ATMOSPHERE

This aspect of authority and discipline involves primarily the pervasiveness of the parents' control in the child's life, and the extent to which the child is on his own, doing as he likes, or is restricted by the parent. It differs from the democratic-autocratic variable, which measures the way in which control is achieved; this variable measures the amount of freedom available to the child.

Restrictive home atmosphere is related to ratings of non-rivalrous and passive behavior and to unpopularity with other children.

MILD-SEVERE DISCIPLINE

The behavior ratings for children given severe home discipline are, in general, consistent with the pattern shown by children from autocratic and restrictive atmospheres: nonrivalrous, insensitive to others' opinions, inconsiderate of others, unpopular with other children; in addition, these children are rated as nonaffectionate and hesitant in expressing themselves verbally.

RAPPORT WITH PARENTS

This variable does not appear to be closely related to behavioral differences in children. Two differences were found: Children high in energy output showed the better rapport with mothers. Children in good rapport with fathers are less recklessly uninhibited than children in poor rapport with fathers. It would be incorrect to conclude from these results that the degree of rapport between child and parent is unimportant for child behavior. The items on the rapport scale did not discriminate among these parents sufficiently to permit a meaningful division of the children into a group of good rapport and a group of poor rapport with their parents. On the scale of rapport, out of a total possible score of 14, 81 per cent of the mothers scored between 12 and 14 points; 73 per cent of the fathers scored between 11 and 14 points. The variabilities are too limited for a meaningful distinction between good rapport and poor rapport for these children.

RELATIVE RESPONSIBILITY OF MOTHER AND FATHER
IN DISCIPLINE OF CHILD

There are few behavior differences associated with this difference in the home. Where both parents share in the discipline

responsibilities, children tend to be less rivalrous and less compliant in preschool and are rated higher in leadership than children from homes where mothers carry nearly all the discipline responsibilities.

SIBLING RELATIONS

Homes show considerable variation in the degree of harmony among siblings. We are not here concerned with the causal factors contributing to good or bad sibling relations, although they constitute an interesting problem for investigation. Sibling relations are, however, a part of the authority and discipline relations within the home, for not only do *parents* exercise disciplinary influences upon the child, but *children* place considerable restrictions and requirements of behavior upon one another. As a part of home atmosphere, rapport among the children does not seem less important than relations between child and parents. The parents' inventory included questions concerning the kind of rapport among the siblings. On the basis of these questions children were placed in two groups (those for whom jealousy and quarreling with siblings were reported and those for whom they were not), and associated differences in behavior ratings were determined. Children for whom jealousy and quarrels with their siblings are infrequent are rated by their teachers as quieter, less rivalrous in preschool, able to "get along" better with other children, less energetic, more passive and colorless, more compliant to adults in preschool, more emotionally stable, and less a "tomboy" or "regular fellow" in behavior than children for whom quarrels and jealousy are reported in their sibling relations.

A satisfactory interpretation of these relationships is difficult. It appears that a greater amount of sibling quarreling and jealousy occurs with the group of children manifesting the greater amounts of energy, activity, and personal color. The children showing less harmony in sibling relations appear to do so by virtue of their less socialized (quiet, passive, less energetic, less rivalrous) behavior, which makes for many fewer opportunities for interactions of any sort with their siblings, and hence for fewer inharmonious ones. It is impossible from these data to say which pattern of behavior is the more conducive to, or symptomatic of, good adjustment. Since the degree of discord among these children is not excessive (with the possible exception of three of the cases), one cannot conclude that sibling conflict

does not have detrimental effects upon the child's adjustment. Extremes of incompatibility among siblings might show striking patterns of concomitant maladjustment by the child in non-sibling relations, whereas occasional quarreling and jealousy do not, because the change from the occasional discord to extreme conflict is probably more than a change in *amount* of discord. The character of the quarrels and jealousies is no longer that of "friendly" quarrels and rivalries but is seen as a serious threat to the child's position in the family and his security; such conflicts might be highly frustrating experiences for the child.

SUMMARY

Variations in the behavior of preschool children occur concomitantly with variations in home discipline atmosphere reported by the parents, even when these variations are relatively slight and are from an otherwise homogeneous sample of homes. The results of this analysis indicate fairly consistently a complicated conduct pattern in preschool children that is related to home atmospheres characterized by autocratic, restrictive, and severe discipline. Scattered relationships appear in connection with the other authority variables. Sibling relationships seem to be related to several aspects of the child's conduct in preschool. Because the number of subjects is fairly small and because the disciplinary variability within these homes is of limited range, it is significant that such consistent trends have appeared.

It is impossible from these data to say anything about the causative relations between parental behavior and child behavior. Investigators have frequently made the error of interpreting results like these as evidence that differences in parent behavior are the *causes* of differences in child behavior. The relationship is much less simple. We can conceive of it correctly only by recognizing the reciprocal, simultaneous, and interacting effects of parent upon child behavior and child upon parent behavior. Only in this manner can we interpret the findings here.

The results of these comparisons cannot be interpreted as well-established relations between home atmospheres and child behavior. The variations in child behavior which seem to occur concomitantly with variations in home atmosphere, along with the theoretical interpretations of the constellations of behavior

as they have appeared, constitute a first approximation to a more intensive study of the dynamics involved.

HOME ATMOSPHERES AND EXPERIMENTAL SITUATIONS OF COMPLIANCE

Differences in the authority and discipline relations in the home have been shown to be associated with differences in ratings of general behavior of the child in preschool. A more severe test of the relation between home variables and behavior comes in measuring differentials in child behavior in specific and identical experimental situations. The situations chosen for this test involve the compliance or noncompliance of the child with adult authority—a behavior situation most directly related to the aspects of the home being studied. The nature of these situations is described in detail in Chapter IV. The behavior in the compliance situations was scored on quantitative scales measuring the degree of compliance or noncompliance.

Directions for scoring Compliance Situation I: The child is requested to wait until the experimenter is ready. Compliance with this request is scored in terms of qualitative behavior changes and the time intervals. The experimental situation consists of five half-minute periods. Scores are assigned as follows, a high score denoting compliance, a low score noncompliance:

SCORE	BEHAVIOR
16	Five half-minute periods—complete acquiescence.
15	Four half-minute periods—complete acquiescence; one period—attempts to leave the situation through amiable conversation.
14	Three half-minute periods—complete acquiescence; two periods—amiable conversation.
13	Two half-minute periods—complete acquiescence; three periods—amiable conversation.
12	One half-minute period—complete acquiescence; four periods—amiable conversation.
11	Five half-minute periods—attempts to leave through amiable conversation.
10	Four half-minute periods—attempts to leave through conversation; one period—stronger attempts to leave through verbal attempts to obtain play materials.
9	Three half-minute periods of conversation. Two periods—verbal attempts to obtain play materials.
8	Two half-minute periods of conversation. Three periods—verbal attempts to obtain play materials.
7	One half-minute period of conversation. Four periods—verbal attempts to obtain play materials.
6	Five half-minute periods of conversation.
8	Two half-minute periods—amiable conversation; three periods—verbal attempts to obtain play materials.
7	One half-minute period—amiable conversation; four periods—verbal attempts to obtain play materials.
6	Five half-minute periods—verbal attempts to obtain play materials.
5	Four half-minute periods—acquiescence, conversation, or verbal attempts to obtain play materials; one period—seizure of materials.

82 PARENTAL AUTHORITY AND CHILDREN'S BEHAVIOR

- 4 Three half-minute periods—acquiescence, conversation, or verbal attempts to obtain play materials; two periods—seizure of materials.
- 3 Two half-minute periods—acquiescence, conversation, or verbal attempts to obtain play materials; three periods—seizure of materials.
- 2 One half-minute period—acquiescence, conversation, or verbal attempts to obtain play materials; four periods—seizure of materials.
- 1 No heed to adult request, seizure of materials in first period.

Directions for scoring Compliance Situation II: The child is required to draw a maximum of twenty faces. For each drawing trial, commands are given at 15-second intervals until the child begins to draw or until five such commands have been given. In scoring the responses, the number of pictures drawn and the number of commands given are considered. The maximum compliance score equals 100: 20 faces, each drawn at the first command, each given 5 points. One point is deducted for each additional command required per drawing; for example, a face drawn after two commands is given 4 points; one drawn after five commands is given 1 point; and so on.

Directions for scoring Compliance Situation III: The child is commanded to lie down on the floor. The commands are repeated at 5-second intervals until the child begins to comply or until five such commands have been given. The number of commands required for compliance is taken as the score. One point more than the maximum number of commands is given in cases of refusals at the fifth command, running away, and the like.

A total score on compliance was obtained by combining the scores (after they had been put in comparable form) of the three compliance situations.

Comparisons between home atmospheres and experimental compliance behavior show disappointingly slight differences, which may be due to chance factors.

In the course of experimentation with the compliance situations, it became more and more apparent that the experimental situations had not the same meaning for all children in the study. Situation I, which required the child to wait docilely while the experimenter apparently had forgotten him, seems more accurately described as a situation measuring the self-assertive behavior of the child as well as his compliance with adult authority.

Situation II, which required the drawing of faces, proved a tiresome and irritating task for most of the children, but for a small minority it was a pleasant occupation. Only by having continued the drawings until every child had become satiated with the task could a measure of compliance have been obtained under similar circumstances for all the children.

Situation III, a command to the child to lie down, had an ambiguous meaning for the children. To some it was the unreasonable command situation intended by the experimenter. To others it had none of the unpleasantness of an unreasonable command.

These evaluations of the experimental situation show clearly the importance of considering the meaning of the situation for the individual child, as well as the objective constancy of the situations in their meaning to the adult.

DIFFERENCES IN PARENT-CHILD RELATIONS RELATED TO SEX DIFFERENCES

Sex differences in psychological characteristics are frequently reported in the literature. Though for the most part these differences are small, much smaller than the variability within either sex, their persistence and, in some areas, their consistency constitute a challenge to research. Particularly interesting is a developmental study of the origins and magnitude of these differences.

It seemed feasible to examine the data of this study in regard to sex differences; first, to see whether differences exist in parents' standards and discipline for boys and for girls, and second, to see whether the relationships between girl and parent differ from those between boy and parent, and whether such differences are reflected in the children's reactions toward the home.

The parents' conception of what is desirable behavior in the child is one index of the degree of similarity between the behavior standards set for boys and girls. In the inventory the parents were asked to express their preferences in regard to six kinds of child behavior: a submissive or aggressive child; a child popular with children or one popular with adults; a sweet, babyish child or an independent, mature child; a "little lady" or "little gentleman" or a "tomboy" or "regular fellow"; a quiet child or a chatterbox; a bold, daring child or a timid, cautious child. (Items 121-26.) The percentages of parents preferring (*very much* or *somewhat*) each kind of behavior were compared to discover possible differences in preferences for boys and girls. When the parents as a group are considered (Figure 5) the large majority of them choose the aggressive child, the child popular with other children, the independent and mature child, the tomboy and regular fellow, and the chatterbox. The opinions on the bold or timid child are more evenly divided. The differences between mothers' and fathers' preferences are not significant. The largest differences are in preferences of submissive behavior (20 per cent of the mothers and only 6 per cent of the fathers prefer a submissive child, *CR* 1.94) and in preferences of the little lady




FIGURE 5.—MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' PREFERENCES IN CHILDREN'S BEHAVIOR




FIGURE 6.—PARENTS' PREFERENCES IN BOYS' AND GIRLS' BEHAVIOR




FIGURE 7.—MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' PREFERENCES IN BOYS' AND GIRLS' BEHAVIOR

or little gentleman (19 per cent of the fathers and only 9 per cent of the mothers express such preference, *CR* 1.28).

Next, parents of boys and parents of girls were compared (Figure 6). There are no differences except in regard to submissive and aggressive behavior. Parents more frequently prefer submissive girls than submissive boys (24 per cent and 9 per cent respectively, *CR* 1.87).

A further breakdown of the data was made to compare mothers' preferences for girls, fathers' preferences for girls, mothers' preferences for boys, and fathers' preferences for boys. These results are given in Figure 7. The greatest differences are in choices of submissive or aggressive children. Mothers prefer

submissive to aggressive boys more frequently than do fathers (17 per cent and 0 per cent respectively, *CR* 1.98). Mothers would rather have submissive girls than submissive boys (41 per cent and 17 per cent respectively, *CR* 1.81). Fathers too prefer submissive girls more frequently than submissive boys (11 per cent and 0 per cent respectively, *CR* 1.55). Discrepancies are largest between mothers' choices of submissive girls and fathers' choices of submissive girls (*CR* 2.51), and between mothers' choices of submissive girls and fathers' choices of submissive boys (*CR* 4.00).

In preferences for girls in submissive or aggressive behavior, ladylike or tomboy behavior, bold and daring or timid and cautious behavior, sweet and babyish or independent and mature behavior, there is a tendency for fathers to prefer the traditional feminine behavior in girls and for mothers to prefer more frequently the more masculine behavior in girls. There is no similar or reverse trend with regard to boys.

The kind of behavior which the parent desires in his child undoubtedly has some bearing upon the kinds of restrictions and supervision which he imposes on his child. If the above differences in preferences for boys' and girls' behavior are sufficiently large, they should be reflected in differences in the discipline scales and in the children's interview responses. No sex differences, however, were found on the discipline scales from the parents' inventory. Children's interview answers show a pattern of differences for boys and girls which is consistent with the differences in parents' behavior preferences.

The success which boys and girls report in "breaking through" parental commands or restrictions (interview items 47 and 48) indicates greater frequency of success by boys. In other words, the parent tolerates opposition or aggressive behavior toward his own commands more readily from boys than from girls (see Table 13). The only technique in which girls achieve greater success than boys is in overcoming the wishes of the mother through crying or tantrums.

Further substantiation of the above hypothesis is found in the relative frequency with which threatened punishment is carried out with boys and girls: For the girls, 71 per cent of the mothers carry out their punishments, for the boys 47 per cent. For the girls, 48 per cent of the fathers carry out their punishments, for the boys 44 per cent. (Interview items 43 and 44.)

In answers to what is "good" and "bad" behavior girls show greater awareness of obedience to the mother than do boys.

There is only one contradiction to this trend in the children's reports: in the slightly larger number of boys than girls reporting that obedience is demanded by the parents (interview items 6 and 7).

Miscellaneous differences appearing in the interview responses of boys and girls are these: More parents spank girls than boys; more parents isolate boys than girls. Girls confide in their parents more frequently than boys. Boys fear their parents more frequently than girls. The mother is named as the best liked person by 4 per cent of the girls and 21 per cent of the boys; the father by 21 per cent of the girls and 5 per cent of the boys. Only the boys name the father (11 per cent) or both parents (6 per cent) as the most disliked person.

None of the differences reported between boys and girls are statistically significant, but the small differences which have appeared incidentally in these data suggest the fruitfulness of a more thorough exploration of sex differences and differential parental standards.

SUMMARY

Generalizations concerning interrelations between data on the parental scales of home atmosphere and other data on the child can be made only with reservations. The home authority relations measured in the population of this study cover a very limited part of the total range of democratic-autocratic, freedom-giving-restrictive, mild-severe discipline variations which are to be found in a more heterogeneous population of parents. If trends are apparent within the homogeneous sample studied, then greater and more practically significant differences can be expected when the range of variability of homes is increased.

An examination of the various dimensions of parental discipline, such as was made in this study, is undoubtedly a more precise and adequate approach than one in which discipline is characterized merely as effective or ineffective. Attention to the separate dimensions of discipline is particularly important when it is remembered that there was no correlation among the various dimensions of discipline as measured by the parental scales. Discipline is clearly a multiphasic variable.

VIII. ANALYSIS OF PROJECTIVE PICTURE DATA

The use of pictures in the study of child personality is based on the hypothesis that children project the attributes of their own personal worlds into the stimulus field in which they are reacting. The picture procedure used in this study required a choice by the child of one of a pair of pictures, matched in all but one variable.

This technique creates a highly structured situation. The subject's field of response is narrowed to one of two choices in the aspect of personality or environment varied in the picture pairs.

There were 33 picture pairs representing these variables:

A. Child's relation to mother (child shown with mother under pleasant versus unpleasant circumstances).

B. Child's relation to father (child shown with father under pleasant versus unpleasant circumstances).

C. Child's perception of mother (mother shown in a pleasant versus an unpleasant mood).

D. Child's perception of father (father shown in a pleasant versus an unpleasant mood).

E. Child's perception of father-mother relations toward one another (parents shown in pleasant versus unpleasant reaction toward one another).

F. Child's perception of his home atmosphere (combination of A, B, C, D, E).

The pictures were presented in a random order so that pairs of one variable did not necessarily appear successively but were scattered among pairs of the other variables.

SCORING OF PICTURE RESPONSES

The responses to the pictures were recorded as + or -. The plus and minus were assigned to opposing qualities represented in the pictures; that is, choices of a child shown with a father under pleasant circumstances were scored plus, choices of the unpleasant mother were scored minus, choices of the pleasant mother were scored plus, and so on. On this basis the score of each child on each of the variables A to F was determined by counting the number of plus or minus responses given.

RELIABILITY OF THE PICTURE DATA

A measure of the retest consistency of responses to the pictures was obtained by comparing the choices of pictures made in interview I and in interview II, a time interval of four to five weeks elapsing between interviews. One such measure consisted of determining the extent to which the same individual pictures were chosen at both interviews. On this basis, the percentage of agreement from first to second interview was 65 per cent (15 per cent better than chance). A second measure of retest consistency was obtained by correlating the score obtained on a given picture variable at the first interview with the score obtained on the same variable at the second interview. The coefficients are given in Table 18. Since these coefficients are based

TABLE 18.—RELIABILITY OF PICTURE SCORES

Picture Variable	Number of Pairs for Each Variable	r	Significance Level of r (Per cent)*
A. Relation to mother.....	6	.47	1
B. Relation to father.....	5	.27	
C. Perception of mother.....	6	.48	1
D. Perception of father.....	8	.31	5
E. Father-mother relations	6	.41	1
F. Home atmosphere	31	.54	1

* For a sample of given size, Lindquist has computed the minimum value of r that will be significant at the 5 per cent and 1 per cent levels. The table is given in E. F. Lindquist, *Statistical Analysis in Educational Research*, p. 212.

on short series of pictures, higher values might conceivably be expected with the presentation of a greater number of picture pairs for each variable. Thus the coefficient of reliability for variable F, which represents a longer series, is appreciably higher than the other correlations.

VALIDITY OF THE PICTURE DATA

More fundamental than the question of reliability is the question of how much or how accurately projective techniques portray significant attributes of the personality or of the child's environment. To answer this question for the pictures of this study, picture scores (scores of interview I plus interview II) were related to interview responses, to teachers' ratings, to experimental situations of compliance, and to doll findings (which are discussed in Chapter IX).

RELATIONS BETWEEN PICTURE SCORES AND OTHER DATA
ON THE HOME ATMOSPHERE

Ten children showed markedly deviating scores on pictures of the home atmosphere. Five had very high scores (51 or more out of a possible 62), indicating that they had chosen almost exclusively the pictures depicting a pleasant home atmosphere. Five had very low scores (29 or less), indicating that they had chosen mostly the pictures depicting an unpleasant home atmosphere. The average scores of these two deviate groups were compared with respect to the other data on the home from the parent and child interviews.

In none of the comparisons on parental discipline scales are the high and low deviates on the pictures differentiated. Comparisons of children's interview responses and picture scores are also without significant differentiations. Correlations between scores on discipline scales and picture variables showed only negligible relationships. This is to say that for the pictures used and the home variables studied, the parents' and the children's reports about the home are not related to the children's selection of pleasant or unpleasant home atmospheres in the pictures.

At the time of the home interview with the parents, the experimenter made a rating of the congeniality and compatibility evidenced during the interview. The ratings were made on a seven-point scale, one extreme of which was defined as "congenial compatibility between parents, evidenced by actions toward each other and conversation with and about each other during the interview"; the other extreme was defined as "lack of congeniality and compatibility in relations between parents, evidenced in critical remarks about other parent, references to points of friction in household, and so forth." When picture scores of pleasantness of home atmosphere were correlated with these ratings on congeniality, the coefficient was $+ .33$, a small but significant correlation.

The lack of correspondence between picture and interview responses raises questions concerning the nature of the variables which each is attempting to measure, and the efficiency of each technique in measuring what it purports to measure. It seems highly probably that these two approaches are tapping somewhat different aspects of the child's relation to his parents. The reason for this assumption is that the pictures, unlike the

interviews, do not ask *what* the parent does in a variety of specific circumstances. They do not ask, Does he answer the child's questions? Does the child confide in him? Is he strict and firm in his discipline? Instead the pictures get at *how* the parent does all these things, the kind of mood or temperament which surrounds the parents' actions—whether it is cross, tense, and scolding or warm, relaxed, and pleasant. The pictures, then, are tapping an aspect of parent-child relations that cannot well be verbalized by the child and that the parents themselves would have difficulty reporting.

If this interpretation is accepted, correspondence between picture and interview responses is no longer a question of the validity of either. The lack of correspondence must then be interpreted as evidence that what the parent does in the way of discipline and authority is not necessarily related to the manner or mood in which he does it.

RELATIONS BETWEEN PICTURE SCORES AND CHILD BEHAVIOR

The same question may now be asked of the picture data as of the interview responses: How are differences in the child's perception of parents' pleasantness or unpleasantness of mood related to the child's behavior? Scores on picture variables A, B, and F were correlated with each of the items on the teachers' rating scale. (The child's rating score was the average of the two teachers' ratings.) Significant correlations found between the ratings and the picture scores are given in Table 19.

Children whose picture scores indicate unpleasant relations with their mothers are rated by teachers as predominantly unhappy (+.48) and as insensitive to and little influenced by the opinions of others (+.30). Those whose picture scores indicate unpleasant relations with fathers are rated by teachers as lacking in feelings of rivalry toward other children (+.33) and as seclusive (+.33). There is a negative relation between scores indicating unpleasant relations with the father and teachers' ratings on the tomboy or regular fellow behavior (— .54). Children with unpleasant relations with their fathers tend to have little influence upon other children and to follow rather than to lead (— .32). These children are also rated as somewhat more passive and colorless (+.30) than the other children.

Pleasantness in the parents' mood and manner reflected by picture scores shows a negative relation to child behavior de-

TABLE 19.—RELATIONS BETWEEN PICTURE SCORES AND RATINGS OF CHILD BEHAVIOR

Picture Variable	Behavior Rating	r
Relation to mother (A, unpleasant)	Predominant mood is unhappy.....	+ .48
Relation to mother (A, unpleasant)	Insensitive to and little influenced by criticism, blame, praise, opinion of others.....	+ .30
Relation to father (B, unpleasant)	Little rivalry shown toward other children.....	+ .33
Relation to father (B, unpleasant)	Exerts much influence on other children; leads rather than follows others	— .32
Relation to father (B, unpleasant)	Seclusive; tends to be by himself; few social contacts with other children	+ .33
Relation to father (B, unpleasant)	Behaves like a "tomboy" or "regular fellow".....	— .54
Relation to father (B, unpleasant)	Passive, colorless behavior	+ .30
Home atmosphere (F, pleasant)	Little rivalry shown toward other children.....	— .32
Home atmosphere (F, pleasant)	Exerts much influence on other children; leads rather than follows others	+ .37
Home atmosphere (F, pleasant)	Gets along well with other children; seldom quarrels or fights with them	— .31
Home atmosphere (F, pleasant)	Predominant mood is an unhappy one.....	— .36
Home atmosphere (F, pleasant)	Seclusive; tends to be by himself; few social contacts with other children	— .31

scribed as nonrivalrous (— .32), as unhappy in mood (— .36), as seclusive, making few social contacts (— .31), and as not getting along well with other children (— .31). Pleasant home atmosphere shows a positive relation to leadership behavior (+ .37).

The syndrome, then, for children with parents of unpleasant mood is an unhappy, seclusive child, ineffective socially and lacking in personality color.

The picture scores correlated with scores on the experimental situations of compliance yield a coefficient of + .22, a positive but insignificant relation between compliance and pleasant home atmosphere.

EVALUATION OF PROJECTIVE PICTURE TECHNIQUE

In so far as picture choices give information which is not readily obtainable in other ways, or in so far as they can differentiate differing personality patterns, they are useful experimental and clinical instruments.

The data point to a certain externalizing of the child's personal reactions to the home situation in his choice of pictures. Significant, though not high, relationships exist between choices

of pictures (depicting a variable in the home presumed to be the parents' general pleasantness or unpleasantness of mood in intrafamily relations) and the experimenter's ratings of congeniality in the home, and between choices of pictures and child behavior in the preschool.

The present results do not provide sufficient basis upon which one can unqualifiedly accept or reject the picture technique as a useful method in personality research. The findings are encouraging, however, for more precise research on this technique.

IX. ANALYSIS OF DOLL PLAY DATA

The theory of doll play techniques, as well as the place of doll play methods in this research, has already been discussed. The data which were obtained in the doll play have furnished supplementary clues to home atmosphere and have been studied with regard to their validity in the light of other data on the child's home situation.

SCORING AND RELIABILITY OF DOLL PLAY RESPONSES

A relatively unstructured projective play situation such as that presented here in the doll play has the advantage of allowing the subject to proceed according to his own needs without interference or direction from the experimenter, but such a situation confronts the experimenter with serious problems of scoring and interpreting the results. The scoring and interpretative procedures used here were adopted after preliminary trials with other scoring procedures.

The doll play protocols were read over and the behavior and attitudes manifested in them were listed. From this preliminary form the check list of variables given in the tabulation on page 96 was composed. Each doll play protocol, with the name deleted, was rated by two persons on each category in the check list. Where check list variables did not cover the behavior in the report, the raters had an opportunity to describe this additional behavior. Since the protocols were anonymous, the ratings were independent of other information about the child. The scoring procedure allowed not only a measure of the raters' reliability but also a measure of the consistency of content in children's projective play from one time to the next.

The raters' reliability was measured by obtaining the percentage of agreement in the rating classifications assigned each child on each of the eleven check list variables. This agreement was 90.5 per cent.

The degree of consistency between the doll play in interview I and in interview II was measured separately for each of the check list variables. If the two ratings on the first interview protocol showed identical or only slightly differing behavior on the second interview protocol, the two interview behaviors

were rated as consistent for that category. If there was no agreement or slight agreement between the two pairs of ratings, the interviews were rated as showing different behavior for that category on the two occasions. The percentages of cases showing agreement in behavior in the two interviews are given in Table 20.

TABLE 20.—CONSISTENCY BETWEEN DOLL PLAY BEHAVIOR IN
INTERVIEW I AND INTERVIEW II

Variable	Percentage of Cases Showing Similar Behavior in Interviews I and II
Emotional tone of family situation.....	62
Child's attitude toward mother.....	67
Child's attitude toward father.....	60
Function of home.....	67
Child's relations with siblings.....	65
Functions of mother.....	43
Functions of father.....	41
Mother-father relations	52
Kinds of controls used by parents.....	67
Dominant themes or interests	29
Handling of play situation.....	62
Total behavior ratings.....	60

The similarity of dramatic play in the two sessions varied with the particular aspect studied. General home atmosphere remained fairly constant, more so than appears in the percentages. When a case showed a change in behavior, the change was usually not more than one step on the scale, such as a change from pleasant to neutral or neutral to pleasant. Though different themes were stressed from one interview to the next, there were no radical shifts in affect. A frequent change from interview I to II involved a decrease of interest in the doll play in the second interview. Repetition of the play was often chaotic, and involved behavior irrelevant to the doll materials.

RELATIONS BETWEEN DOLL PLAY DATA AND OTHER DATA ON THE CHILD

Doll play data, analyzed for the kind of home atmosphere shown in the child's dramatic play with the dolls, were related to other information obtained in interview reports, experimental situations of compliance, and picture responses. Since these children are predominantly nonproblem cases and come from

fairly pleasant home atmospheres, the dramatization of the homes in the doll play would be expected to be relatively free from severe hostilities and frictions. The ratings for the total group of subjects in each variable are as follows:

<i>Variable</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Variable</i>	<i>%</i>
1. Emotional tone of family situation created by child with doll materials. (Actions and conversation noted.)		e. giving affection to child.....	1
a. pleasant	30	f. interest in herself.....	8
b. neutral	62	g. not evident in record.....	17
c. unpleasant	4	7. Function of father	
d. not evident	4	a. routine activities	44
2. Child's attitude toward mother (doll)		b. child care	4
a. affectionate and interested...	15	c. child discipline	1
b. neutral	70	d. mother's companion predominantly and helps mother.....	19
c. hostile toward mother.....	8	e. giving affection to child, and child's companion	6
d. not evident in record.....	7	f. goes to work.....	8
3. Child's attitude toward father (doll)		g. not evident in record.....	18
a. affectionate and interested...	21	8. Mother-father relations	
b. neutral	66	a. pleasant	15
c. hostile toward father.....	5	b. neutral	39
d. not evident in record.....	8	c. unpleasant	1
4. Function of home		d. not evident in record.....	35
a. predominantly a place for carrying on routine functions, such as eating, sleeping, etc...	67	9. Kinds of controls used by parents	
b. place for congenial companionship and functions of living..	22	a. kind consideration of child...	12
c. place of friction or tension...	4	b. autocratic commands	2
d. not evident in record.....	7	c. physical punishments	2
5. Child's relations with siblings		d. depreciating remarks about child, scolding	1
a. affectionate and interested...	27	e. not evident in record.....	83
b. neutral or tolerant.....	66	10. Dominant themes or interests	
c. rivalrous or hostile.....	5	a. appearance and clothes.....	16
d. not evident in record.....	12	b. sex	0
6. Function of mother		c. toilet activities	12
a. routines of housework and routine activities	43	d. eating	10
b. child care	15	e. sleeping	31
c. child discipline	2	f. material and furniture arrangements	13
d. father's companion predominantly	14	g. hostility and aggression.....	3
		h. affection or joy	5
		i. others	10
		11. Handling of play situation	
		a. planned and coherent.....	39
		b. chaotic and rambling	39
		c. disinterested	22

The play themes for the group as a whole show homes which are neutral to mildly pleasant in affect. Discipline situations are dramatized relatively infrequently. Themes of routine activities (eating, sleeping, dressing, toilet activities) predominate.

With several exceptions the relationship between the products of doll play and data from other sources is relatively slight. A most notable exception is that the functions of the mother and father portrayed in the doll play are closely related to the

descriptions of parents given by the children in the interviews. In doll data as well as in the interview, routine work functions of the parent play an important role for the child. There is little demonstration, even in the dramatic doll play, of affection relations either between child and parent or between mother and father. The great similarity between doll data and interview data in regard to descriptions of mother and father may be seen in Table 21 and also by comparing Figure 8 with Figure 4.

For comparisons with the other sets of data two groups of children were selected from the protocols, one group ($N=8$) composed of those whose doll play records contained the greatest number of ratings of pleasantness of home atmosphere, congeniality of relations, and happy and affectionate relations with the family, and the second group of those ($N=8$) whose doll play contained the greatest number of ratings of unpleasantness in the home, friction, tension, and hostility. There are negligible differentiations between these two groups on the other measures of parent-child interactions: discipline scales (Table 22), children's interviews, compliance situations, and picture scores.

Since differences did not appear when gross similarities in dramatic play were used to classify the children, case history data for each individual case were compared with the doll play records. For a number of the children the case history findings showed marked similarities to doll play dramas. Alice (Appendix IV) was reported by her mother at the time of preschool entrance as a problem in toilet training and as showing excessive interest in eliminative functions. She had shown similar extreme interest in the preschool, though at present it was less marked. The doll play, too, is concerned predominantly with toilet behavior.

Another example of correspondence between doll play and case history evidence is found for Ivan (Appendix IV), who in the doll play showed hostility and aggression toward his mother and an intense interest in and affection toward his baby sister. In the interview his mother reported difficulty in managing him. Ivan was present when the experimenter arrived at the home. In the short period of interaction observed between him and his family, he went into open battle with his mother, who had no success in handling him. His behavior toward the

TABLE 21.—COMPARISON OF CHILDREN'S DESCRIPTIONS OF MOTHERS AND FATHERS FROM INTERVIEWS AND FROM PROJECTIVE PLAY DATA

Description of Parent in Terms of	Percentage of Responses			
	About Mother		About Father	
	Interview	Projective Play	Interview	Projective Play
Activities				
Work	57.3	51	48	62
Self-recreation	4	...	24	...
Personal factors				
Personality characteristics ...	11.7	...	8	...
Interest in self.....	...	9
Interpersonal relations				
Mother-father interactions7	17	4	24
Affection given child.....	2	2	1	8
Plays with child.....	2	...	4	...
Supervises child	18.3	18	2	5
Punishes child	4	3	6	1
Miscellaneous	3	...

TABLE 22.—AVERAGE SCORES ON HOME ATMOSPHERE VARIABLES OF CHILDREN SHOWING DIVERGENT INTRAFAMILY RELATIONS IN DOLL PLAY THEMES

Home Atmosphere Variable	Children Showing in Doll Themes	
	Happy, Affectionate Relations	Unpleasant, Hostile Relations
Democratic-autocratic (16)*	13.7	12.0
Freedom-giving-restrictive (20)	9.6	7.0
Mild-severe discipline (8)	6.6	6.3
Good-poor rapport with mother (14).....	12.6	12.0
Good-poor rapport with father (14).....	11.0	12.0
Relative responsibility of parents for discipline (mostly mother-equal sharing) (4)	2.2	3.6
Sibling relations (harmonious-inharmonious) (16). ..	15.0	14.0

* Numbers in parentheses refer to total score possible on the scale.

sister was a great contrast; he told the experimenter about her, wheeled her around in the carriage, and finally went, by his own choosing, to another room to play with the baby.

Another instance of relationship is illustrated in the records of Johanna (Appendix IV), who came from a home broken by the recent death of her father. The father's illness and death were dramatized in the doll play, and the child's loneliness for the father was also expressed.

SUMMARY AND EVALUATION OF DOLL PLAY DATA

When single cases marked by some peculiarity of circumstances were selected for study, correspondences between doll




FIGURE 8.—PORTRAYALS OF MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN DOLL PLAY

The portions of the graph represent the frequencies with which various ideas about mothers and fathers are portrayed in the doll play.

Key: W=routine and work; Wo=goes to work outside home; I=interest in self; MF=mother and father are companions of one another; A=affection given child; S=supervises child; P=punishes child.

play and case history were found. When group data were considered, slight relationships between the doll play data and other data on home relations were found.

Reliability of scoring the doll play in this study was demonstrated. The experimental procedure gave no measure of the reliability of recording, however. Since the analysis of the other data on the child and his home followed the recording of doll play, there was no bias in the direction of recording play behavior according to findings from the other data on the child. A fair degree of consistency was found in each child's pattern of behavior from the first to the second doll session.

If the researcher hopes to find projections of home variables which will differentiate children in dramatic play according to differences in the home, it appears that for relatively small variations within family relations, such as in the families of this study, this technique of doll play does not make sufficiently fine discriminations of home differences. That such discrimination would be found in contrasting groups of problem and non-problem homes seems highly probable.

The technique of free doll play as it was used in this study

raised several interesting questions of methodology which may have an influence upon the diagnostic value of the play behavior. Since the children were required to arrange the physical setting as well as to act out the social relations, much time was spent in manipulative activity, apart from the time spent on the main problem of how the child perceives the personal interactions within the home. There are two reasons for letting the child organize his own physical surroundings (rooms, furniture, and so on): It allows the inhibited, shy child to work into the situation gradually, so that when it is time for him to bring personal interactions into the scene, original resistances or unrealities of the play situation may have been overcome. Second, allowing the child to arrange the physical setup may facilitate his portrayal of his own family relations by making the setup similar in some ways to his home.

A type of analysis that suggests itself in the use of this technique of presenting doll play is the measurement for each child of the relative weight of physical setting and of social interaction. This differential may prove interesting in relation to the child's social behavior.

There are disadvantages, too, in the present procedure: The child may tire of the doll material while spending all his time in the manipulative activities; the procedure does not allow the experimenter to create a like situation for all his subjects or to create the kind of situation he wants. Much work in the methodology of doll play—the effects of such variations as the amount of structuring of the situation, the kind of equipment, the mental set with which the child is made to confront the materials (whether he is asked to portray a specific kind of drama or is allowed to do as he likes with the doll materials), the part of the experimenter—might well precede further studies attempting to find the relations between dramatic play products and the needs and circumstances of the child.

For normal, nonproblem, preschool children, free doll play of the kind used in this investigation allows only limited diagnosis and cannot, by itself, be used for purposes of diagnosis. Frequently it reveals interesting clues concerning the behavior style of the home, and occasionally current difficulties or worries of the child are expressed.

X. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The dynamic relations of intrafamily behavior were studied in a group of preschool children and their parents. The sample consisted of a fairly homogeneous group of professional and semiprofessional urban families. Data were obtained (1) from the parents through questionnaires and interviews; (2) from the preschool teachers through ratings of the children's behavior in the preschool; and (3) from the children in two individual interviews consisting of (a) picture and doll play projective techniques, (b) a series of experimental situations measuring the child's reactions to various types of adult authority, and (c) an oral questionnaire designed to reveal the child's perception of, reaction to, and role in, the home.

The nature of authority and discipline in these homes was studied. From the parents' reports on discipline in their childhood and discipline now given to their children, there is evidence of a decrease in the emotionality of parent-child discipline situations, a decrease in the autocratic methods of control, an improved parent-child rapport, and a greater responsibility taken by the fathers of the present generation in the discipline of young children.

The preschool children responded to the interview questions with clarity and with fewer clouding inhibitions or rationalizations than are often characteristic of the older individual in similar circumstances.

The children's standards of good and bad behavior emphasize behavior which fits into the adult routine and which avoids the displeasure of adults. The mother, rather than the father, is perceived by the children as the more influential authority in their lives. A further difference between mothers' and fathers' roles as reported by the children is the less frequent but more severe punishments given by fathers than by mothers. In other respects there are slight differences in the behavior of mothers and fathers. There is some evidence of differential girl-parent and boy-parent relationships.

Children report spanking and isolation as frequent disciplinary measures. Other types of punishment are not mentioned

by the children. According to the child's responses, the parental punishment does not motivate him toward better behavior. The child accepts his parents as his rightful authorities, and in general he advocates as the proper discipline the kind he receives.

For these children mothers and fathers in the abstract are primarily people engaged in the routines of daily work and living. In the child's verbalized ideas about parents there is little personality or affection content.

Some relationships are found between scores on home discipline atmosphere, derived from the parents' inventories, and ratings of children's behavior in preschool and in experimental situations. Tentative theories are offered as to the nature of these relationships.

Projective techniques with pictures and doll materials were investigated as sources of supplementary data on home and child interactions. There is some evidence of projection of the home situation in the picture and doll play responses. The usefulness and validity of these techniques are discussed.

COMPARISON OF FINDINGS WITH PREVIOUS REPORTS IN THE LITERATURE

The studies reported in the literature on parent-child relationships present chaotic and contradictory results. The reason for this state of affairs lies partly in the superficial manner in which these variables have so frequently been investigated. Parental behavior as objectively rated by interviewer or clinician perhaps does not give the real atmosphere of the home. Since it has been shown in the present research that the same events in the home are perceived differently by parents and by child, these perceptions undoubtedly differ also from the objective situation.

If we assume that the individual's perceptions and conduct are functions of his needs and satisfactions, then we must seek understanding of the child's and the parents' behavior in these terms. The parent behavior classified as rejection or overprotection by the observer may or may not have these meanings for the parent or child participants. Hence, consistent child behavior concomitants cannot be expected.

These factors present many difficulties in research. Probably where home variables reach an extreme state of rejection, lack of harmony, defective discipline, and so on (as may be found

in the problem populations which have contributed the greater proportion of data in this field), the perceptions of child, parent, and observer are more similar than in the great bulk of cases lying within the "normal" range of behavior. These similarities of perceptions at the extremes undoubtedly account for what agreement there is in the research results.

Reported variables of parental behavior which appear to be similar in their effect upon the child's feelings of security are rejective attitudes by the parent, inharmonious family relations, and restrictive authority and discipline. If the child behavior associated with these conditions of insecurity are compared for previous and present findings, the following constellations appear:

	<i>Inharmonious Homes*</i>	<i>Rejective Homes*</i>	<i>Restrictive Homes†</i>
<i>Child Behavior</i>	Aggressive	Submissive	Unpopular with
	Hyperactive	Aggressive	children
	Neurotic	Adjustment dif-	Nonrivalrous
	Lying	ficulties	Passive, colorless
	Jealous	Sadistic	
	Delinquent	Nervous	

Adjustment difficulties are common to each of the constellations. The reactions of the "restricted" children in this study appear to be less adverse than the reactions of the clinical groups in the literature.

Other variables from the literature and in this study that may be similar in their meaning to the child are homes with dominating parents and homes with autocratic parents. The behavior constellations appearing with these variables are as follows:

	<i>Dominating Parents*</i>	<i>Autocratic Parents†</i>
<i>Child Behavior</i>	Quarrelsome	Doesn't get along with other
	Uncooperative	children
	Tense	Noncompliant
	Bold	Unstable emotionally
	Disinterested	Uninhibited
	Dependable	Inconsiderate
	Shy, submissive, polite	Insensitive
	Self-conscious	Nonrivalrous
		Unpopular

* See summary of literature on parent-child relationships, Chapter II.

† See Chapter VII.

Though not without some contradictions, the behavior patterns are similar.

In general the results of the present investigation confirm the previously reported findings on the positive influences of the home on child behavior. Children from homes in which the child is given responsibility are reported by Hattwick (1936) to be self-reliant and secure and by Myers to be well-adjusted in school. Self-reliant, cooperative, responsible behavior was reported for children coming from homes characterized by a logical, scientific approach (Updegraff, 1939). Similar dimensions of the home, namely, freedom-giving and democratic atmospheres, were found in this study to be related to preschool behavior characterized as popular, rivalrous, active, and colorful and as otherwise indicative of good adjustment.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF THIS RESEARCH

This study extends our knowledge in this field by obtaining a description of the nature of discipline and authority patterns in one stratum of our culture, by determining the changes that have occurred from the preceding to the present generation, by pointing out the young child's clear perception of complex social relationships within the home, and by investigating the role of the home in the social behavior of the child.

By combining a number of methods of obtaining data, corroborative evidence on the same problem was obtained. Interview methods with the young child demonstrated the availability of significant data through this approach.

The possibility of locating critical areas in the child's home relations and of getting his reaction to known home situations through the use of projective picture and doll play technique is partially confirmed.

The interview and the projective techniques provide the experimenter with a clear picture of family interactions from the child's point of view, free from adult rationalizations and biases. The present form of interview, in which the interviewer has in mind the questions he wants to ask the child but in which he proceeds in a free conversational manner, allowing the child the maximum in self-direction, seems well suited for these subjects and for obtaining data of the kind used here. Probably a standardized formal question-and-answer technique would not be applicable or equally informative. The extension of this

method of interviewing to other groups of children seems desirable not only for obtaining data on home authority but for understanding more fully the motivations of children.

By studying carefully the child's point of view in home relations, the present study has made us aware of gaps in the parents' understanding of the child and the child's understanding of the parent. The child of this age cannot be expected to see the situation as the parent sees it, but perhaps the parent can be brought closer to the child by being made aware of the child's point of view, thus facilitating mutual understanding.

PROBLEMS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

With this research a host of new problems appear and more gaps in our information become apparent. A few of the specific questions it raises are these: Can discrepancies between the perceptions of parent and child be taken as a symptom of harmonious or inharmonious family relations? How pervasive should parental authority over the child be in order to give the child optimal supervision and at the same time allow him optimal self-direction?

In rather incidental data available in this study, differential relationships between mother and girl, mother and boy, father and girl, and father and boy are suggested. A more thorough investigation of such sex differences in this aspect of family relations might be enlightening in regard to sex differences in personal, social, and emotional characteristics reported elsewhere.

Home authority and discipline at different age levels, at various levels of society, and in diverse cultural groups need to be investigated and their differences in standards of behavior and ideologies compared. With an understanding of the dynamics involved in intrafamily relations, a sound program of training adults to assume effective parental roles seems not so inaccessible. Though many factors influencing family conduct are still obscure, research indicates that training in effective parental style, rather than training in procedures per se, must be the goal of parent educators.

XI. APPLICATIONS AND THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS

The investigation of complicated conduct patterns of the individual, of groups, and of cultures is necessary not only to a psychology which remains at a level of mere description of phenomena but even more to a psychology which is interested in effecting desirable changes within the individual and culture. Behavior style and cultural style do not spring up full-grown; they are developed under the ceaseless impact and interaction of a multitude of forces. Understanding these forces is the best means of achieving control of behavior. That we are able to change behavior is not sufficient; we must understand how the changes are brought about if we are to make them precise and predictable.

This investigation of home atmosphere and child behavior was undertaken with the ultimate goal of attempting to change in desired directions parental and child values and behavior. The findings have a number of applications and give a basis for several tentative hypotheses. For the parent educator the results point to a need for education of parents in the authority-discipline area of home relationships. The findings speak only for a select section of the parent population, but the weaknesses in these parents are probably magnified in parents less privileged in intellectual, educational, social, and economic advantages.

Parents still fail to recognize that the child is entitled to respectful treatment. Too frequently his ego-feelings and needs appear to be regarded as trivial. This is demonstrated in the children's descriptions of their parents' punishment behavior ("He hits me in the face." "She comes and runs and yells at me."); in the substantial proportion of parents described as showing anger in discipline; in the overwhelming proportion of discipline procedures that depend for their effectiveness on the sheer power of the adult or on undermining the child's power. This is a low-order method of obtaining desired behavior from the child. It gives no stimulation for growth of self-dependence in the child. It increases rather than diminishes the probability of future points of disagreement between parent and child be-

cause it fails to recognize that the child, too, strives for power. Since these parental techniques frustrate the child's attempts to gain a secure status with some semblance of power in it, a probable outcome of the frustration is aggression—further attempts to gain power.

The most frequent criticism which the preschool child makes of the parents' behavior is the interference with the child's activities. This bears out well the preceding discussion.

Some comparisons of differences in social perception associated with the different roles of the observers were possible in analyzing the data from parents and children on discipline relations. The role differences were between givers and recipients of discipline; the recipients in two generations perceived the discipline as more severe and less reasonable than it appeared to the givers. This finding has both practical and theoretical interest. Practically, it points to the need for the parent's consideration of the meaning of his behavior to the child. Without this caution strict, severe, or misunderstood discipline may be traumatic to the child without the parents' being aware of this effect. Theoretically, the demonstrated differences in social perception associated with role differences are important in understanding behavior in other areas of social interaction. Intergroup as well as interpersonal misunderstandings and maladjustments may be accounted for in part by differences in perception of the same situation by participants playing different roles in the situation.

From the analysis of the children's interview responses, insight was gained into the origins of children's values and behavior. Concepts of good and bad behavior, concepts of mother and father seem closely related to the child's experiences at home. His behavior standards correspond closely to the standards required by the parents. At this age the child's concept of the parents is derived from their overt behavior in the home. That the child is sensitive to the various moods, idiosyncracies, and affectional relations within the family is demonstrated in the child's interview responses.

The study of relationships between home atmospheres and teachers' ratings of child behavior gives evidence that the child takes over in his own behavior with other children the behavior of the parent. Thus it appears that in order to obtain desired behavior from the child, the parent must manifest such be-

havior himself; that is, the child may be expected to enact the same kind of behavior in other social contexts as he experiences in the home. If this generalization is carried farther, the social or cultural implications become apparent: Tremendous responsibilities rest upon the home as an important area for concentrated attempts to effect changes in social and cultural relations. This does not mean that the home is the only powerful agent in the behavior development of young children. It must be seen as one of many factors affecting behavior.

APPENDIX I. PARENTS' INVENTORY

The following statements are descriptive of discipline factors in *your own childhood*. UNDERLINE THE WORD BELOW EACH STATEMENT WHICH MOST NEARLY DESCRIBES YOUR EXPERIENCE.

- | | VERY MUCH | SOMEWHAT | VERY LITTLE |
|---|-----------|-----------|-------------|
| 1. My parents liked to have me bring playmates into our house to play. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 2. My parents let me play with any child I wanted to. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 3. As a child I had a voice in making the family plans and decisions. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 4. I shared my thoughts and feelings and hopes and fears with my father. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 5. The punishment I received as a child was given by my mother. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 6. My parents expected me to be neat and tidy in the house. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 7. My father was strict and firm in disciplining me when I was a child. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 8. My parents followed the rule: "A child should be seen and not heard." | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 9. I obeyed my mother. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 10. If I did not want to do what my mother asked, she "gave in" to me. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 11. My parents punished me by spanking me. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 12. My parents punished me by scolding me. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 13. My parents punished me by isolating me (sending me to bed, locking me in a room, etc.). | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 14. My parents punished me by taking away something I liked or by depriving me of privileges. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 15. My parents punished me by shaming me. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 16. My parents bribed me (giving me candy if I behaved, etc.). | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 17. My parents punished me by letting me suffer the natural results of my misconduct. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 18. My parents punished me by telling me they would not love me if I were naughty. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 19. My parents punished me by frightening me. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 20. I shared my thoughts and feelings and hopes and fears with my mother. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 21. The punishment I received as a child was given by my father. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 22. My mother was strict and firm in disciplining me when I was a child. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 23. I obeyed my father. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 24. If I did not want to do what my father asked, he "gave in" to me. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |

110 PARENTAL AUTHORITY AND CHILDREN'S BEHAVIOR

- | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-------------|
| 25. My mother was "easy" on me as a child. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 26. As a child, I quarreled with my sisters or brothers. | VERY MUCH | SOMEWHAT | VERY LITTLE |
| 27. I was jealous of my sisters and (or) brothers as a child. | VERY MUCH | SOMEWHAT | VERY LITTLE |
| 28. My sisters and (or) brothers were jealous of me as a child. | VERY MUCH | SOMEWHAT | VERY LITTLE |
| 29. My parents favored me more than they did my brothers and (or) sisters. | VERY MUCH | SOMEWHAT | VERY LITTLE |
| 30. My parents favored my brothers and (or) sisters more than they favored me. | VERY MUCH | SOMEWHAT | VERY LITTLE |
| 31. My parents' household was planned around the needs and interests of the children. | VERY MUCH | SOMEWHAT | VERY LITTLE |
| 32. My father was "easy" on me as a child. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 33. When I didn't get my own way with my parents, I cried, screamed, or had a temper tantrum. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 34. When I didn't get my own way with my parents, I sulked, brooded, pouted, or became stubborn. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 35. When I didn't get my own way with my parents, I gave up trying and did what they wanted. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 36. When I didn't get my own way with my parents, I argued, begged, coaxed. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 37. When I didn't get my own way with my parents, I bargained or reasoned. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 38. I got my own way by ignoring my parents' orders and just doing as I pleased. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 39. Punishments from my mother were mild. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 40. My father tried to push me ahead and to make me excel. | VERY MUCH | SOMEWHAT | VERY LITTLE |
| 41. As a child I loved my father. | VERY MUCH | SOMEWHAT | VERY LITTLE |
| 42. My mother "babied" me when I was a child. | VERY MUCH | SOMEWHAT | VERY LITTLE |
| 43. My parents supervised me. | VERY MUCH | SOMEWHAT | VERY LITTLE |
| 44. As a child I feared my mother. | VERY MUCH | SOMEWHAT | VERY LITTLE |
| 45. My parents answered my questions frankly and patiently. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 46. As a child I felt that my father did not love me. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 47. I could tell ahead of time what would bring punishment from my mother. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 48. As a child I loved my mother. | VERY MUCH | SOMEWHAT | VERY LITTLE |
| 49. Punishments from my father were severe. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 50. I had my own way as a child. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 51. My parents expected unquestioning obedience from me. Their word was law. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 52. I resented the punishments which my parents gave me. | VERY MUCH | SOMEWHAT | VERY LITTLE |
| 53. My mother showed love and affection for me as a child. | VERY MUCH | SOMEWHAT | VERY LITTLE |

54. My parents left my questions unanswered.	USUALLY	SOMETIMES	RARELY
55. My father played with me when I was a child.	VERY MUCH	SOMEWHAT	VERY LITTLE
56. As a child I feared my father.	VERY MUCH	SOMEWHAT	VERY LITTLE
57. I could tell ahead of time what would bring punishment from my father.	USUALLY	SOMETIMES	RARELY
58. As a child I liked my mother more than my father.	VERY MUCH	SOMEWHAT	VERY LITTLE
59. My mother tried to push me ahead and to make me excel.	VERY MUCH	SOMEWHAT	VERY LITTLE
60. My father expressed his anger when punishing me.	USUALLY	SOMETIMES	RARELY
61. My parents agreed about punishing me.	USUALLY	SOMETIMES	RARELY
62. As a child I felt that my mother did not love me.	USUALLY	SOMETIMES	RARELY
63. My father showed love and affection for me as a child.	VERY MUCH	SOMEWHAT	VERY LITTLE
64. Punishments from my mother were severe.	USUALLY	SOMETIMES	RARELY
65. My parents explained to me their reasons for punishing me.	USUALLY	SOMETIMES	RARELY
66. As a child I liked my father more than my mother.	VERY MUCH	SOMEWHAT	VERY LITTLE
67. Punishments from my father were mild.	USUALLY	SOMETIMES	RARELY
68. My mother expressed her anger when punishing me.	USUALLY	SOMETIMES	RARELY
69. My father "babied" me when I was a child.	VERY MUCH	SOMEWHAT	VERY LITTLE
70. My mother played with me when I was a child.	VERY MUCH	SOMEWHAT	VERY LITTLE

The following statements are descriptive of discipline factors concerning your child. UNDERLINE THE WORD BELOW EACH STATEMENT WHICH MOST NEARLY DESCRIBES YOUR CHILD'S SITUATION.

71. I play with my child.	VERY MUCH	SOMEWHAT	VERY LITTLE
72. My child is easy to manage.	USUALLY	SOMETIMES	RARELY
73. My child asks me questions.	VERY MUCH	SOMEWHAT	VERY LITTLE
74. I am strict and firm with my child.	USUALLY	SOMETIMES	RARELY
75. I enforce the rule: "A child should be seen and not heard."	USUALLY	SOMETIMES	RARELY
76. If my child does not want to do what I ask, I "give in" to him.	USUALLY	SOMETIMES	RARELY
77. I like to have my child bring his playmates into our house to play.	VERY MUCH	SOMEWHAT	VERY LITTLE
78. The discipline I give my child is severe.	USUALLY	SOMETIMES	RARELY
79. My child has a voice in making the family plans.	USUALLY	SOMETIMES	RARELY
80. This child is harder to control than his brothers or sisters.	VERY MUCH	SOMEWHAT	VERY LITTLE
81. This child is popular with his brothers and sisters.	VERY MUCH	SOMEWHAT	VERY LITTLE
82. This child quarrels or fights with his brothers and sisters.	VERY MUCH	SOMEWHAT	VERY LITTLE

112 PARENTAL AUTHORITY AND CHILDREN'S BEHAVIOR

- | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-------------|
| 83. Other children in the family are jealous of this child. | VERY MUCH | SOMEWHAT | VERY LITTLE |
| 84. This child is jealous of other children in the family. | VERY MUCH | SOMEWHAT | VERY LITTLE |
| 85. My child shows affection for his father. | VERY MUCH | SOMEWHAT | VERY LITTLE |
| 86. I am too busy to answer my child's questions. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 87. My child knows ahead of time whether or not I will discipline him for what he does. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 88. The discipline my child receives is given by his father. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 89. I discipline my child by spanking him. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 90. I discipline my child by isolating him (sending him to bed, putting him in his room, and the like). | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 91. I discipline my child by taking away his pleasures or privileges. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 92. I discipline my child by shaming him in front of others. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 93. I offer my child rewards to get him to obey me. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 94. I discipline my child by making him suffer the natural results of his bad behavior. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 95. I discipline my child by telling him that his mother or father will not love him any more if he is bad. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 96. My child obeys me. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 97. The discipline I give my child is mild. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 98. I encourage my child to forge ahead, to development of his abilities to the utmost. | VERY MUCH | SOMEWHAT | VERY LITTLE |
| 99. My child shows affection for his mother. | VERY MUCH | SOMEWHAT | VERY LITTLE |
| 100. Our household is planned around the needs and interests of the child. | VERY MUCH | SOMEWHAT | VERY LITTLE |
| 101. I supervise my child. | VERY MUCH | SOMEWHAT | VERY LITTLE |
| 102. The discipline my child receives is given by his mother. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 103. I get my child to obey by warning him (telling him God will punish him, or the policeman will put him in jail, and the like). | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 104. When he doesn't get his own way, he gives up trying and does what I tell him. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 105. When he doesn't get his own way with me, my child is likely to cry, scream, or have a temper tantrum. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 106. When he doesn't get his own way, my child sulks, pouts, or gets stubborn. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 107. When he doesn't get his own way, my child bargains or reasons with me. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 108. My child gets his own way by ignoring my orders and just doing as he pleases. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |
| 109. My child fears his mother. | VERY MUCH | SOMEWHAT | VERY LITTLE |
| 110. I am easygoing with my child. | USUALLY | SOMETIMES | RARELY |

111. I answer my child's questions frankly and patiently.	USUALLY	SOMETIMES	RARELY
112. I let my child have his own way.	USUALLY	SOMETIMES	RARELY
113. My child resents the discipline I give him.	VERY MUCH	SOMEWHAT	VERY LITTLE
114. My child is expected to be neat and tidy in the house.	VERY MUCH	SOMEWHAT	VERY LITTLE
115. My child fears his father.	VERY MUCH	SOMEWHAT	VERY LITTLE
116. I expect unquestioning obedience from my child.	USUALLY	SOMETIMES	RARELY
117. Before disciplining my child, I explain why I am disciplining him.	USUALLY	SOMETIMES	RARELY
118. I show affection toward my child.	VERY MUCH	SOMEWHAT	VERY LITTLE
119. My child tells me his thoughts and feelings, his hopes and fears.	USUALLY	SOMETIMES	RARELY
120. I "baby" my child.	VERY MUCH	SOMEWHAT	VERY LITTLE
121. I prefer a submissive child to an aggressive one.	VERY MUCH	SOMEWHAT	VERY LITTLE
122. I prefer to have a child popular with other children to one popular with adults.	VERY MUCH	SOMEWHAT	VERY LITTLE
123. I prefer a sweet and babyish child to an independent and mature one.	VERY MUCH	SOMEWHAT	VERY LITTLE
124. I prefer a "little lady" or "little gentleman" to a "tomboy" or a "regular fellow."	VERY MUCH	SOMEWHAT	VERY LITTLE
125. I prefer a quiet child to a "chatterbox."	VERY MUCH	SOMEWHAT	VERY LITTLE
126. I prefer a bold, daring child to a timid, cautious child.	VERY MUCH	SOMEWHAT	VERY LITTLE
127. I am satisfied with the way my child behaves.	VERY MUCH	SOMEWHAT	VERY LITTLE

Describe briefly the differences between the discipline which you give your child and the discipline you received from your parents in your own childhood.

Why do the methods differ?

APPENDIX II. ORAL QUESTIONNAIRE GIVEN TO CHILD

1. Do you have any brothers or sisters at home? Are they [is he, she] littler or bigger than you are?
2. Who is the naughtiest child at your house?
3. Who is the best child at your house?
4. Tell me, what is a good girl [boy]? What does a good girl do?
5. Tell me, what is a bad [naughty] girl [boy]? What does a bad [naughty] girl do?
6. Does your mother make you "mind"? Does she make you do what she tells you?
7. Does your father make you "mind"? Does he make you do what he tells you?
8. Who has to "mind" their mother and father most; do you, or do other children have to "mind" more?
9. When you are naughty, what happens? Who punishes you?
10. When you are naughty, what does your mother do?
11. When you are naughty, what does your father do?

114 PARENTAL AUTHORITY AND CHILDREN'S BEHAVIOR

12. Who punishes you harder, your mother or your father?
13. How do children feel after their mother or father punishes them? Do you?
14. Do some mothers and fathers sometimes punish their children when the children don't need to be punished? Do yours?
15. Does your father get angry [cross, mad] when he has to punish [method indicated by child in 11] you?
16. Does your mother get angry [cross, mad] when she has to punish [method indicated by child in 10] you?
17. Should children always do what their mother and father tell them to do? Why?
18. Before your mother punishes [method indicated in 10] you, does she tell you why she is doing it?
19. Before your father punishes [method indicated in 11] you, does he tell you why he is doing it?
20. Do you think children are ever afraid of their fathers? Are you? Why?
21. Do you think children are ever afraid of their mothers? Are you? Why?
22. Do your mother and father help you a lot?
23. Do you wish that they would help you more?
24. Do you wish that they did not help you so much?
25. Do your mother and father let you play with anybody you want to play with? [If answer is no, ask why.]
26. Does your mother tell you all the time to keep your feet off the chairs, not to scratch the furniture, not to get it dirty?
27. Does your mother like it when you bring children into the house to play?
28. If you have a secret [if you know something], do you like to tell it to your mother?
29. If you have a secret [if you know something], do you like to tell it to your father?
30. Do you ask your mother a lot of questions? Does she answer them? [Does she tell you?]
31. Do you ask your father a lot of questions? Does he answer them? [Does he tell you?]
32. Whom do you like most of all?
33. Whom don't you like very much?
34. Whom do mothers like most of all? Does your mother?
35. Whom do fathers like most of all? Does your father?
36. What do you and your father do together that is fun?
37. What do you and your mother do together that is fun?
38. If you wanted an ice-cream cone very much and your father said no, what would your mother say if you asked her?
39. If you wanted to go out to play and your mother said no, what would your father say if you asked him?
40. If your mother told you to come and help her, and your father told you to come and help him, whom would you help?
41. If your father said you must play outside in the yard, and your mother said you must play in the house, where would you play?
42. What should mothers and fathers do when their children are naughty?
43. When your mother says she is going to punish you [method indicated in 10] does she always do it?
44. When your father says he is going to punish you [method indicated in 11] does he always do it?
45. Can you tell ahead of time that your mother will punish you [method indicated in 10] when she finds out what you are doing?
46. Can you tell ahead of time that your father will punish you [method indicated in 11] when he finds out what you are doing?
47. If you were playing outside and your mother told you to stop playing and to come into the house, would she let you keep on playing if you (a) didn't pay any attention to her and went right on playing; (b) cried and screamed; (c) said, "I don't want to come in the house; I won't come"; (d) begged and teased and said, "Please let me stay outside"?
48. If your father told you to put away all your toys and go to bed, and you didn't want to go to bed, would he let you keep on playing if you (a) didn't pay any attention to him and went right on playing; (b) cried and screamed; (c) said,

"I don't want to go to bed; I won't go"; (d) begged and teased and said, "Please let me stay up"?

49. Where do you like to be most of all?
50. What does your mother do that you don't like her to do?
51. What does your father do that you don't like him to do?
52. Does your mother like you just the way you are, or would she like you to be different? [How would she like you to be?]
53. Does your father like you just the way you are, or would he like you to be different? [How would he like you to be?]

APPENDIX III. TEACHERS' RATING SCALE

As a part of a study of the personality development of preschool children, you are asked to make some ratings of the children who are under your daily supervision and observation.

The judgments you are asked to make are in the form of a graphic rating scale of 20 items relating to social and personality development.

Each behavior item to be rated is represented by a horizontal line; each end of the line represents one of the extremes of the behavior in question. These extremes are described on the scales. The distance between the ends represents all degrees of behavior from one extreme to the other. The middle position represents behavior which cannot be distinguished as tending toward either side.

You will make your ratings of each child by placing a mark at the position on the behavior line which best describes him. For example: In rating the appetites of Bill, a hearty eater, of Mary, a very poor eater, and of Jock, a good but not ravenous eater, your rating would look something like this:

Hearty appetite, eats every- thing and enjoys it.	Little appetite or interest in food, often refuses it.
<i>Bill</i> ———— —————	
<i>Mary</i> ————— —————	
<i>Jock</i> ————— —————	

One kind of behavior is described on each of the following pages. For each behavior pattern, read the descriptions at both ends of the line. Do not make your ratings until you have the behavior clearly in mind. Then rate all the children listed on the page before going on to the next behavior item.

When rating a child on one kind of behavior, disregard everything else about the child except the characteristic which you are rating. Do not let yourself be influenced by your general impression of the child. Consult no one else in making your ratings.

RATING SCALE

1. Constantly talking
or wanting to talk;
"chatterbox."

Seldom talks much,
hesitates to express
himself verbally.

Hilda _____

Ivan _____

Kurt _____

Etc. _____

116 PARENTAL AUTHORITY AND CHILDREN'S BEHAVIOR

- | | |
|--|---|
| 2. Rivalry shown toward other children. | Little rivalry shown toward other children. |
| 3. Exerts little influence on other children; follows rather than leads others. | Exerts much influence on other children; leads rather than follows others. |
| 4. Low energy output; slow in word and action; only mild expenditure of energy in work or play. | Excessive energy output; quick in word and action; frequent violent expenditures of energy in work or play. |
| 5. Shows and desires tenderness and affection in relations with others. | Shows little tenderness and affection in relations with others; dislikes affection given him. |
| 6. Self-conscious, shy, retiring; easily flustered and embarrassed in presence of others. | Well-poised, self-assured in presence of others; not easily flustered or embarrassed. |
| 7. Dependent upon adult; seeks adult attention, help, praise, or direction. | Independent of adult in work and play; prefers to take care of himself. |
| 8. Popular with other children; liked, admired, frequently chosen by them for play. | Unpopular with other children; disliked, avoided, or shunned by them. |
| 9. Does not get along well with other children; frequently annoys them; quarrels or fights with them. | Gets along well with other children; seldom quarrels or fights with them. |
| 10. Considerate of others; kind, sympathetic, and unselfish toward them. | Inconsiderate of others; unsympathetic, selfish, and unkind toward them. |
| 11. Opposes adult control; defiant attitude toward authority; noncompliant; does what is prohibited. | Offers no resistance to adult control; compliant; obedient; does what is asked without question. |
| 12. Predominant mood is a happy one. | Predominant mood is an unhappy one. |
| 13. Defends himself successfully against verbal or bodily attacks from other children. | Unable to defend himself against verbal or bodily attacks from other children. |
| 14. Frequent changes in mood; easily upset emotionally, with sudden outbursts of temper, crying, elation, depression, etc. | Good emotional control; few sudden or extreme shifts in mood except with good and obvious reason. |
| 15. Sociable; makes friends easily; enjoys group activities and the companionship of other children. | Seclusive; tends to be by himself in work and play; few social contacts with other children. |
| 16. Behaves like a "perfect little lady" or "perfect little gentleman." | Behaves like a "tomboy" or "regular fellow." |
| 17. Bold, daring, uninhibited; plunges recklessly into new situations. | Very cautious and inhibited; hesitates unduly before attempting anything new. |
| 18. Keenly aware of everything going on around him; lively interest in his environment. | Little interest in events around him; dreamy and only mildly aware of his environment. |
| 19. Sensitive to and influenced by the criticisms, praise, blame, and opinions of others. | Insensitive to and little influenced by criticisms, praise, blame, and opinions of others. |
| 20. Active, colorful behavior. | Passive, colorless behavior. |

APPENDIX IV. EXCERPTS FROM DOLL PLAY RECORDS

IVAN (*Interview I*) Father, you go to work. [Takes him away.] Here's the mother. I'll fix everything up. I want all the dolls. I'll put them under the bed. [Laughs and sings "ma, ma, ma."] Daddy comes home from work. Takes the supper out. We won't use this table. Oh, for a card table. Dresser up here. Clock. Bathroom here. [Sings.] Daddy sits down. Now mother. Brother. [Picks doll up. Puts him back and takes a second mother doll.] They eat supper. Now, gotta clear off the table. This is a little table to put her milk on when she needs it. Her little heady on it. [Puts mother and daddy into two beds. Takes mother's shoes off.] Everybody's going to bed. [Puts boy to bed next to mother's bed. Pulls his shoes off.] Little dolly [baby] goes to sleep. Goo, goo. Oh, mother has to sleep here [next to baby]. First we gotta make the beds all over again. [Puts extra dolls away.] Goodness gracious! Does her dress come off? I can. But can I get it on, that's the idea. I'll have to try. Now you go to sleep [puts baby in bed]; at 8:00 you're going to have your milk, goo, gee. [Sings.] These extra dolls will sleep on the card table. I think I'll tear this dress off. She'll sleep in the box. Now you eat supper. She's going to sleep in the bathtub. [Sings loudly.] Now morning! They all get up. [Puts extra dolls in box and on table. Takes mother up and puts on shoes.] She can stand up without holding. Then he gets up and puts his shoes on [boy]. Put his shoe on, thank you. [Puts mother and boy together.] Golly, now you stand up. He's stretching his hands up [daddy]. [Tries to get father's clothes off.] Now you're going to bed [daddy]. He's never going to eat. How do you like that? [spoken to father doll]. [Puts mother on shelf.] You're going in room by yourself until you're good [to mother doll]. Now will you be good? I'll say shut up. . . . These mothers are going downtown. She's going to take a bath. [Puts her on toilet, screams.] I'm going downtown, I'm talking in telephone.

IVAN (*Interview II*) [Runs to drawer to get baby doll.] I want a little girl. Where is a bed that fits her? [Looks around for bed to fit baby. Gets up and looks outdoors.] Is this the mother? Ishy! I don't want a mother. She stinks! [Throws mother in drawer.] Little girl! Daddy, go somewhere else. [Puts him away in drawer.] Mother stinks! . . .

ALICE (*Interview I*) Girl goes to bed and mother and daddy stay up late. Daddy is biggest, so mother goes to bed first. Sister. Now you sit down. [Seats girl at table.] She doesn't know where the soup is. She goes to toilet. Then she pulls her dress down. Sister has her very own table. [Examines mother.] She has new pants. She's going to toilet. She has to pull her pants down. Undresses. Sister forgot to flush it. She has to hold her garters. She has to pull pants up and skirt down. Do you know which is my father and my mother and me [points]? Father is biggest. Father has to go to toilet. It's sewed on [refers to doll's clothes]. He's biggest. He doesn't need to. But mother did. [Seats mother and father at table.] Just as he sits down he has to go. I'll tear his coat off. [Sets him on toilet.] He has to stand up. He has a penis. He fell into toilet. [Stands him at toilet.] Mother falls off chair. She's so anxious to get something. Girl lies down on chair. She's so tired [laughs heartily]. [Makes dolls fall repeatedly.]

JOHANNA (*Interview I*) Where's the bathtub? There are a lot of things. We need a daddy. No, 'cause the daddy's dead. Mine is dead. He had pneumonia. He had to stay in the hospital like my mother. She had to stay there four weeks and I had to stay at my grandma's. [Puts girl and mother in beds. Sets out all the furniture.] My mother almost missed her class. We walked to school today. [All the time rearranging furniture.] We'll put two tables together. This would be for a baby. The little girl has to sit down. [Picks up mother.] Oh, her shoe came off. [Puts it on.] I wish we had a daddy. Like a father. Or a baby. I want a father from up there [in box]. [Reaches for father doll.] I wonder if we could take his clothes off. [Tries. Then takes mother and pulls her clothes up, but when they do not come off immediately, she sets mother at table.] I wish they could have a bath. The little girl should have a bath. I take a bath almost every night. [Seats daddy at table. They all fall. Sets up another table. Girl alone at table. Mother alone at second table. Seats father on bench. Sets beds in box with father in a bed, girl in a bed, mother in a bed. Carefully gets everything in place in box.]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ACKERMAN, M. W. 1938. Constructive and destructive tendencies in children: an experimental study. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 8:265-85.
- AMEN, E. A. 1941. Individual differences in apperceptive reactions: a study of the response of preschool children to pictures. *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 23:319-85.
- ANDERSON, J. E. 1944. Freedom and constraint or potentiality and environment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 41:1-29.
- ANDERSON, J. P. 1940. The relationships between certain aspects of parental behavior and attitudes and the behavior of junior high school pupils. *Teachers College Contributions to Education*, No. 809. New York: Columbia University.
- AYER, M. E., and R. BERNREUTER. 1937. A study of the relationship between discipline and personality traits in young children. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 50:165-70.
- BALKEN, E. R., and A. VANDER VEER. 1940. The clinical application of the thematic apperception test to neurotic children. *Psychological Bulletin*, 37:517. (Abstr.)
- BARUCH, D. W. 1937. A study of reported tension in interparental relationships as co-existent with behavior adjustment in young children. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 6:187-204.
- . 1940. Doll play in preschool as an aid in understanding the child. *Mental Hygiene*, 24:566-77.
- BAVELAS, A. 1942. A method for investigating individual and group ideology. *Sociometry*, 5:371-77.
- BELLAK, L. 1942. An experimental investigation of projection. *Psychological Bulletin*, 39:489-90. (Abstr.)
- BENDER, L., and A. WOLTMANN. 1936. The use of puppet shows as a psychotherapeutic method for behavior problems in children. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 6:341-54.
- . 1937. The use of plastic material as a psychiatric approach to emotional problems in children. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 7:283-90.
- BERKMAN, M. 1932. A comparative study of the influence of family attitudes on delinquency and non-delinquency. *Smith College Studies in Social Work*, 3:198. (Abstr.)
- BRYAN, C. E. 1940. An experimental study of the dramatization of family life situations by young children. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Minnesota.
- BURT, C. 1929. *The young delinquent*. New York: D. Appleton and Company.
- CHAMPNEY, H. 1941a. The measurement of parent behavior. *Child Development*, 12:131-66.
- . 1941b. The variables of parent behavior. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 36:525-42.
- CONN, J. H. 1939. The child reveals himself through play: the method of the play interview. *Mental Hygiene*, 23:49-70.
- DESPERT, J. L. 1940. A method for the study of personality reactions in preschool age children by means of analysis of their play. *Journal of Psychology*, 9:17-29.
- DUVALL, E. W. 1937. Child-parent social distance. *Sociology and Social Research* 21:458-63.
- ERICKSON, E. H. 1940. Studies in the interpretation of play. Clinical observation of play description in young children. *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 22:557-671.
- FAEGRE, M., and J. E. ANDERSON. 1940. *Child care and training*. (5th edition revised.) Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- FOSTER, A. 1927. A study of the personality make-up and social setting of fifty jealous children. *Mental Hygiene*, 11:53-77.
- FRANK, L. K. 1939. Projective methods for the study of personality. *Journal of Psychology*, 8:389-413.
- FREUD, A. 1928. *Introduction to technique of child analysis*. Washington, D.C.: Nervous and Mental Diseases Publishing Company.
- FRIES, M. E. 1937. Play technique in the analysis of young children. *Psychoanalytic Review*, 24:233-45.

- GITELSON, M. 1938a. Clinical experience with play therapy. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 8:466-78.
- . 1938b. Section on "Play Therapy." *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 8:499-524.
- GOODENOUGH, F. L. 1931. *Anger in young children*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- GOSSET, H. 1932. A comparative study of well adjusted and delinquent siblings. *Smith College Studies in Social Work*, 3:201. (Abstr.)
- GOTTEMOLLER, R. 1939. The influence of certain aspects of the home environment of the adjustment of children to kindergarten. *Smith College Studies in Social Work*, 9:303-59.
- HATTWICK, B. W. 1936. Interrelations between the preschool child's behavior and certain factors in the home. *Child Development*, 7:200-26.
- HATTWICK, B. W., and M. STOWELL. 1936. The relation of parental overattentiveness to children's work habits and social adjustments in kindergarten and the first six grades of school. *Journal of Educational Research*, 30:169-76.
- HEALY, W. 1915. *The individual delinquent*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- HOLMER, P. 1937. The use of the play situation as an aid to diagnosis. A case report. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 7:523-31.
- HOROWITZ, R., and L. MURPHY, 1938. Projective methods in the psychological study of children. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 7:133-40.
- KALHORN, J. 1944. Values and sources of authority among rural children. In *Studies in topological and vector psychology III*. University of Iowa Studies in Child Welfare, 20.
- KARLIN, E. 1930. The neurotic child: a study of fifty children manifesting functional nervous disorders. *Smith College Studies in Social Work*, 1:93. (Abstr.)
- KATZ, R. 1942. Contribution to play analysis of children. *Zeitschrift Kinder-psychiat*, 8:173-77.
- KLEIN, M. 1932. *The psycho-analysis of children*. New York: W. W. Norton and Company.
- KNIGHT, E. M. 1933. A descriptive comparison of markedly aggressive and submissive children. *Smith College Studies in Social Work*, 4:168. (Abstr.)
- LENER, E., and L. MURPHY (eds.). 1941. *Methods for the study of personality in young children*. Monograph of the Society for Research in Child Development. Vol. 6, No. 4.
- LEVY, D. 1933. Use of play technique as experimental procedure. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 3:266-77.
- . 1937. Studies in sibling rivalry. Research Monograph, American Orthopsychiatric Association, No. 2.
- . 1939. Trends in therapy: release therapy. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 9:713-36.
- LEWIN, K. 1939. Experiments in social space. *Harvard Educational Review*, 9:21-32.
- . 1944. Constructs in psychology and psychological ecology. In *Studies in topological and vector psychology III*. University of Iowa Studies in Child Welfare, 20.
- LEWIN, K., R. LIPPITT, and R. WHITE. 1939. Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created "social climates." *Journal of Social Psychology*, 10:271-99.
- LINDQUIST, E. F. 1940. *Statistical analysis in educational research*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- LIPPITT, R. 1940. An experimental study of authoritarian and democratic group atmospheres. In *Studies in topological and vector psychology I*. University of Iowa Studies in Child Welfare, 16, No. 3.
- LOWENFELD, M. 1938. The theory and use of play in the psychotherapy of children. *Journal of Mental Science*, 84:1057-58.
- MACFARLANE, J. W. 1938. Family influences on children's personality development. *Childhood Education*, 15:55-58.
- . 1942. Problems of validation inherent in projective methods. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 12:405-11.
- MELTZER, H. 1935. Children's attitudes to parents. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 5:244-65.

- . 1941. Sex differences in parental preference patterns. *Character and Personality*, 10:114-28.
- MEYERS, C. 1944. The effect of conflicting authority on the child. In *Studies in topological and vector psychology III*. University of Iowa Studies in Child Welfare, 20.
- MURPHY, G., L. MURPHY, and T. NEWCOMB. 1937. *Experimental social psychology*. New York: Harpers and Brothers.
- MURRAY, H. A. 1938. *Explorations in personality*. New York and London: Oxford University Press.
- MYERS, T. R. 1935. Intra-family relationships and pupil adjustment. *Teachers College Contributions to Education*, No. 651. New York: Columbia University.
- NEWELL, H. W. 1934. Psycho-dynamics of maternal rejection. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 4:387-403.
- . 1936. A further study of maternal rejection. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 6:576-607.
- PIAGET, J. 1932. *The moral judgment of the child*. London: Kegan Paul.
- ROGERS, C. R. 1939. *The clinical treatment of the problem child*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- ROSS, B. 1931. Some traits associated with sibling jealousy in problem children. *Smith College Studies in Social Work*, 1:364-76.
- SANFORD, R. 1936. The effect of abstinence from food upon the imaginal process. *Journal of Psychology*, 2:129-36.
- SCHWARTZ, L. A. 1932. Social-situation pictures in the psychiatric interview. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 2:124-33.
- SEWALL, M. 1930. Some causes of jealousy in young children. *Smith College Studies in Social Work*, 1:6-22.
- SIMPSON, M. 1935. Parent preferences of young children. *Teachers College Contributions to Education*, No. 652. New York: Columbia University.
- SOLOMON, J. G. 1938. Active play therapy. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 8:479-98.
- STOTT, L. 1939. Some family life patterns and their relation to personality development in children. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 8:148-60.
- . 1940a. Adolescents' dislikes regarding parental behavior, and their significance. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 57:393-414.
- . 1940b. Home punishment of adolescents. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 57:415-28.
- . 1941. Parent-adolescent adjustment: its measurement and significance. *Character and Personality*, 10:140-50.
- SYMONDS, P. M. 1939. *The psychology of parent-child relationships*. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company.
- TAFT, J. 1933. *The dynamics of therapy*. New York: Macmillan Company.
- TALLMAN, F. F. and L. N. GOLDENSOHN. 1941. Play techniques. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 11:551-62.
- TEAGARDEN, F. 1940. *Child psychology for professional workers*. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- UPDEGRAFF, R. 1939. Recent approaches to the study of the preschool child. III. Influence of parent attitudes on child behavior. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 3:34-36.
- WATSON, M. 1940. Play techniques. *Journal of Pediatrics*, 17:674-79.
- WEISS-FRANKEL, A. B. 1941. Play interview with nursery school children. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 11:33-40.
- WITMER, H. L. 1933. Parental behavior as an index to the probable outcome of treatment in a child guidance clinic. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 3:431-41.
- WRIGHT, B. A. 1941. An experimentally created conflict expressed in a projective technique. *Psychological Bulletin*, 38:718. (Abstr.)
- . 1942. The development of the ideology of altruism and fairness in children. *Psychological Bulletin*, 39:485-86.
- YERANIAN, O. 1932. A follow-up study of forty delinquent children referred by the juvenile court to a child guidance clinic. *Smith College Studies in Social Work*, 3:198. (Abstr.)
- ZIMMERMAN, A. 1931. Parental adjustment and attitudes in relation to the problems of five and six year old children. *Smith College Studies in Social Work*, 1:406-7. (Abstr.)

INDEX

- Ackerman, M. W., 21
 Affection, of children for parents, 62; of parents as perceived by children, 62, 63
 Aggressive behavior in children, in doll play, 96; and home environment, 12, 103; and maternal rejection, 4, 6; parents' reactions to, 83-86
 Anderson, J. E., 2, 3
 Anderson, J. P., 11, 12
 Authority, parental, and adolescent behavior, 10; and child behavior, *see* Discipline, Punishment; in child's life, 2-3; comparison of mothers' and fathers' reports on, 46-48; dimensions of, 2; in parents' childhood, 35-44; with their children, 44-51; philosophy of, 2, 36, 37-38, 46-47, 74, 76-77, 98
 Autocratic atmosphere, 103. *See also* Democratic atmosphere
 Ayer, M. E., 7-8, 12
 Baruch, D., 7, 21
 Bavelas, A., 52, 53
 Behavior, *see* Aggressive behavior; Child behavior; Dominative behavior; Parental behavior; Preschool behavior; Submissive behavior
 Bellak, L., 22
 Bernreuter, R., 7-8, 12
 Bryan, C., 21
 Burt, C., 6, 12
 Champney, H., 3, 26
 Child behavior, child's standards of good and bad, 52-54, 71, 101, 107; and parental authority, *see* Authority; parents' preferences in, 83-87. *See also* Aggressive behavior; Dominative behavior; Parental behavior; Preschool behavior; Submissive behavior
 Children, anger in, 27; data from, 23-33; in present study, 24-25, 101
 Clinical literature on projective techniques, 17-19
 Clinical studies of parent-child relationships, 4-7; limitations of, 6-7
 Commands, agreeing-disagreeing, positive-negative, 8-9. *See also* Compliance
 Compliance, of child to adult commands, 8-9, 11, 12, 50; experimental situations, 32-33, 81-83
 Conn, J., 18
 Control, parental, *see* Authority, Discipline; of parents by children, 66-67
 Delinquent children, 6, 12, 19, 21, 103
 Democratic atmosphere, 36, 37-38, 46-47, 74, 76-77, 98
 Despert, J., 20
 Discipline, parental, and child behavior, *see* Home environment; children's reactions to, 57-59; comparison of parent and grandparent generations in, 35-44, 101; consistency of, 2, 4, 6, 65-66; differences in reports by child and parent, 43, 44-46, 90, 107; methods of, 2, 7-8, 41, 48-49, 50, 56, 101-2, 106-7; pervasiveness of, 2; philosophy of, *see* Authority, philosophy of; reports by children of, 55-56; role of mother and father in, 37, 38, 41, 46-48, 51, 71, 75, 78-79, 98, 101. *See also* Aggressive behavior; Authority; Democratic atmosphere; Dominative behavior; Home environment; Parental behavior; Parent-child relationships; Punishment; Restrictions; Submissive behavior
 Doll play data from present study, description of parents in, 96-98; evaluation of, 98-100; excerpts from, 117; relation to case-history data, 97, 98; relation to experimental compliance situations, 97; relation to home ratings, 97; relation to parental questionnaire, 97-98; relation to projective picture series, 97; reliability of, 94-95; scoring of, 94, 96
 Dominative behavior in parents and children, 6, 12, 103
 Duvall, E., 10
 Faegre, M., 3
 Father, children's descriptions of, 68-71, 102; descriptions in doll play, 96-98, 99; role in discipline, 37, 38, 41, 46-48, 51
 Fear of parents, 59
 Foster, A., 6, 12
 Frank, L. K., 17, 22
 Free associations of children about parents, 9, 32-33, 71-72
 Freud, A., 18
 Fun with parents, 62-63
 Gitelson, M., 18
 Goldensohn, L. N., 18
 Goodenough, F. L., 27
 Gosset, H., 6, 12

122 PARENTAL AUTHORITY AND CHILDREN'S BEHAVIOR

- Gottmoller, R., 7, 11
 Grant, E., 8, 11, 12
- Hattwick, B. W., 5, 7, 12, 104
- Home environment, and child behavior, 1, 3-12, 73-81, 104; and experimental compliance situations, 81-83; and preschool behavior, 7-8, 11-12, 21, 73-81, 104; and projective doll play behavior, 97-98. *See also* Aggressive behavior; Authority; Democratic atmosphere; Discipline; Dominative behavior; Parental behavior; Parent-child relationships; Punishment; Restrictions; Submissive behavior
- Horowitz, R., 15, 20
- Ideologies of children, measurement of, 52, 53
- Inventory, parental, 109-13. *See also* Questionnaire-interview, parental
- Kalhorn, J., 52
 Karlin, E., 6, 12
 Klein, M., 18
 Knight, E., 6, 12
- Leadership, 74-75, 77, 91-92
 Lerner, E., 21-22
 Levy, D., 18
 Lewin, K., 1
 Lippitt, R., 1, 36
- MacFarlane, J., 17, 43
 Meltzer, H., 9, 60, 63, 70-71
 Meyers, C., 8-9, 11, 12, 50
- Mother, children's descriptions of, 68-71, 102; descriptions in doll play, 96-98, 99; role in discipline, 37, 38, 41, 46-48, 51
- Murphy, G., 4
 Murphy, L., 4, 15, 20, 21-22
 Murray, H., 19
 Myers, T., 11, 12, 104
- Neurotic children, 6, 12, 103
 Newcomb, T., 4
 Newell, H., 4, 11, 12
- Obedience, children's reasons for, 58-59. *See also* Commands; Compliance
- Oedipus relationship, 62
- Overprotection, *see* Rejection
- Parental behavior, children's dislikes in, 67-68; relation to child behavior, 3-12, 73-81, 102-4, 106-8. *See also* Parent-child relationships
- Parental preference, 9-10, 64; relation to parent-child rapport, 60-64
- Parent-child relationships, comparison of results of present study with previous reports, 102-4; methods of studying, 24; review of literature on, 3-12. *See also* Affection; Aggressive behavior; Authority; Democratic atmosphere; Discipline; Dominative behavior; Home environment; Parental behavior; Punishment; Rejection; Restrictions; Submissive behavior
- Parents, children's descriptions of, 68-71, 102; descriptions in doll play, 96-98, 99; data from, 25-28
- Personality and home environment, *see* Aggressive behavior; Child behavior; Discipline; Dominative behavior; Home environment; Parental behavior; Preschool behavior; Submissive behavior
- Piaget, J., 52
- Play techniques, 18-19, 21-22; doll play, 20-21. *See also* Doll play data from present study
- Popularity, 74-75, 77, 83-85, 103
- Preschool behavior and home environment, 7-8, 11-12, 73-81, 104
- Problem of the study, 24
- Procedure used in the study, 25-28, 101
- Projective picture series, 30-31, 32, 88-93; evaluation of, 92-93; relation to child behavior, 91-92; relation to home atmosphere, 90-91; reliability of, 89; scoring of, 88; validity of, 89
- Projective techniques, concepts underlying, 14; criteria used in this study, 29-30; evaluation of, 16-17, 92-93, 98-100; and experimentally created needs, 22; for obtaining data on children, 2; and psychoanalysis, 18; review of literature on, 14-23; used in this study, 29-32, 88-100, 117; validity of, 17, 22, 89; variations in, 14-16. *See also* Doll play data from present study; Play techniques; Projective picture series
- Psychological atmosphere, *see* Home environment
- Punishment, advocated by children, 64-65; severity of, 36, 38-40, 47-48, 75, 78, 98. *See also* Discipline
- Questionnaire-interview, children's, analysis of, 52-72; Interview I, 28-29; Interview II, 32-33; oral questionnaire, 113-15
- Questionnaire-interview, parental, 25-27, 90, 109-13; analysis of data on grandparent generation, 35-44; analysis of data on parent generation, 44-51

- Rapport, parent-child, 36-37, 38, 41, 48, 68, 75, 78, 98; relation to parental preference, 60-64
- Rating scale of preschool behavior, 33-34, 73, 115-16; relation between ratings and home atmosphere, 73-81; reliability of, 73-74
- Rejection, parental, and child behavior, 4-6, 11, 12, 103
- Reliability, of doll play responses, 94-95; of projective picture series, 89; of rating scale of preschool behavior, 73-74
- Research, contributions of study to, 104-5; further problems, 105
- Restrictions, parental discipline, 36, 38-40, 47-48, 74, 78, 98, 103
- Ross, B., 6
- Sanford, R., 22
- Schwartz, L., 19
- Sewell, M., 6, 12
- Sex differences, in children's descriptions of parents, 69; in children's standards of good and bad behavior, 53-54; in parental preference, 9, 62; in parent-child discipline relations, 5, 55-56, 59, 65, 66-67, 83-87; in parent-child rapport, 10, 61; in parents' preferences in behavior of boys and girls, 83-87
- Siblings, jealousy, 6, 12; relationships, 37, 75, 79-80, 98
- Simpson, M., 9, 63, 64
- Solomon, J., 18
- Stott, L., 10, 12
- Stowell, M., 5, 12
- Subjects of the study, 24-25, 101
- Submissive behavior, and maternal overprotection, 6; and maternal rejection, 5; in parents, and child behavior, 6; parents' preferences in children's behavior, 83-86
- Supervision, parental, 59-60
- Symonds, P., 5, 6, 12, 43
- Tallman, F. F., 18
- Teachers, data from, 33-34; rating scale used by, 115-16
- Teagarden, F., 3
- Thematic Apperception Test, 19, 22
- Updegraff, R., 104
- Validity, agreement between parent and child reports, 44-46; of clinical studies of parent-child relationships, 6-7; of interview-questionnaire method, 27-28; of parental inventory, 44; of parents' reports on authority, 35, 44; of projective picture series, 89; of projective techniques, 17, 22
- Watson, M., 18
- Weiss-Frankel, A., 18
- White, R., 1
- Witmer, H., 5, 11, 12
- Wright, B., 22, 52
- Yeranian, O., 6, 12
- Zimmerman, A., 5

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



116 911

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY